

THE  
CHRISTIAN EXAMINER  
AND  
RELIGIOUS MISCELLANY.

---

SEPTEMBER, 1849.

---

ART. I. — MEMOIRS OF THE BUCKMINSTERS.\*

THIRTY-SEVEN years have elapsed since the sudden death of the two Buckminsters, father and son, produced a sensation in this community which no such event could produce now. We were then, comparatively, a small people. We seemed all to know one another, as we met in the streets. Business, which had never been so engrossing as it has since become, had then, during five years of commercial embarrassments, relaxed something of that hold on the thoughts of men, which is always so tenacious; and if war were already at our doors, many refused to believe it so near, and all looked trustingly to each other for the mutual sympathy and friendly support all would need, if its trials should come.

In the wearisome leisure such a state of things brought with it, we met more frequently than we had been wont to do, and felt involved in each other's welfare and fate as it is impossible we should now, when our numbers are trebled, and our affairs complicated and extended till their circumference is too wide to be embraced by any one mind, and till the interests of each individual are grown too separate and intense to be bound in by any general sympathy with the

---

\* *Memoirs of the Rev. Joseph Buckminster, D. D., and of his Son, Rev. Joseph Stevens Buckminster.* By ELIZA BUCKMINSTER LEE. Boston: William Crosby and H. P. Nichols. 1849. 12mo. pp. 486.

whole. Notwithstanding our old political quarrels, therefore, and notwithstanding our coming theological dissensions, which already cast their shadows before, we were then a more compact, united, and kindly community than we have ever been since or ever can be again. A blow like that which, on one day, numbered with the dead a distinguished clergyman in a neighbouring State and the most brilliant light in our own, — connected together by the nearest relationship, but separated by a distance which left them, and those about them, ignorant of their common danger, till death had united them in heaven ; — such a blow, at such a time, was felt to be an unwonted teaching, whose power and import were generally acknowledged. The hearts of all were moved by it. All felt, and openly said, that a great public loss had been sustained ; that a bright chain had been severed, which was among those that best served to bind together our little community and make its interests one.

An entire generation, as the generations of men are reckoned, has since passed away. The sermons of the younger Buckminster, arranged by his friends, have been published again and again, and such additions made to the original selection as have, from time to time, been demanded by the public or deemed becoming by those intrusted with the care of his reputation and memory. They have been sanctioned by the judgment of minds whose decisions are seldom reversed, no less than by the general regard, as among the best specimens of pulpit eloquence in the language, and as an enduring monument to their author's faithful fulfilment of his duties as a teacher of the religion of Jesus Christ. But this is all. The active portion of the present generation hardly know by tradition the space Mr. Buckminster filled in the thoughts of their fathers, still less the respect and deference felt for him by men much older than himself, — men who were the leaders of affairs at the time, and of characters and opinions the most diverse, — men like Mason and Langdon, Otis and Dexter, Sullivan and Parsons.

But there are those still alive, though their number is rapidly diminishing, who "remember that such things were" ; and there is one, to whom "they were most precious," who has treasured them faithfully in her heart, and now offers them to us for our instruction, in this memorial, strongly marked with the spirit of the period it recalls, and of the



characters it is mainly intended to commemorate. Mrs. Lee, to whom we are indebted for more than one agreeable volume in which the past age of New England is revived, is a daughter of the elder Buckminster, and a much-loved sister of the younger ; — not without traits of character common to both, and not without gifts kindred to those she so much venerated and admired. She is, therefore, singularly fitted for the duty she has undertaken to perform ; and it is praise enough for any one who has fulfilled such a duty, to say that it has been well done.

As an appropriate background to the picture, and one needful to give their relative position and proper relief to the figures upon which she is desirous chiefly to fasten our attention, Mrs. Lee offers us, in her opening chapters, a few sketches of life and manners as they existed in Portsmouth, New Hampshire, and in its neighbourhood, soon after her father became a settled minister there, and when her brother's character was forming under circumstances in many respects favorable, and in others very peculiar. In this she is fortunate. Her recollections seem to be vivid, even back to a very remote period of her childhood ; and the effect she produces by a few touches is occasionally remarkable. Even the old Provincial days, whose traditions were in part the foundation on which manners rested in her youth, do not entirely escape her. But it is when we come within the range of events and circumstances embraced by her own memory that we feel how considerable is her power. We seem to have been present at the meetings of the association of ministers who came together beneath her father's roof ; at their modest but good dinners, and their cheerful, genial talk. We seem to have seen those " delicate-footed gentlemen " with embroidered waistcoats and Mechlin lace ruffles, who were carried home from church in their chariots, as their fathers had been in the statelier days of the Province ; and we seem to have known Mr. Tappan, the schoolmaster, with his devout and fervent wife, and the cheerful Deacon, with whom the young minister lived soon after his settlement, and who kept a small shop and sold pins and snuff by the copper's-worth, without losing a whit of that courtesy in his old-fashioned manners towards his frugal, neatly dressed wife, to which both had been bred in happier days. These, and several similar sketches, such as one of Dr. Stevens, the clergyman of Kittery, whose daughter Dr. Buckminster

married, and whose suspected Toryism, and undoubted intimacy with the Pepperells, prevented him from being made President of Harvard College, — are all presented to us with picturesque effect, and, taken together, give such a view of the circumstances and position of the persons in whom we are most interested, as enables us better to judge what were their relations to the society of which they were a part, — how much they received from its influences, — how much, in return, they gave to it of their own.

One of these sketches — that of the old meeting-house and congregation at York, where the younger Buckminster preached his first sermon — will serve to illustrate what we mean, when speaking of this pleasant portion of Mrs. Lee's volume.

“This meeting-house and congregation of Old York were both among the most ancient and primitive in the country. The venerable old building is now replaced by a modern structure, with slips within, and white paint without. The ancient building was perfect in its iconoclasm. The square, oaken pews, polished and dark with age, were guiltless of all carpet, cushion, or seductive invitation to wandering thoughts; the beams of the ceiling were formed of heavy timber, rough-hewn into form. Beneath the pulpit was an inclosed seat for the elders, two hoary-headed old men, with long, waving locks. Upon the corner of these seats the old frame for the hour-glass kept its place, the sands long since run out and motionless. In front of these was another square inclosed seat for the deacons, and facing them, upon the floor of the meeting-house, were seats for the singers. Within the childish memory of the writer, the hymn was given out two lines at a time, and sung with pauses breaking the harmony of the verses. In each pew, close to the mother's elbow, was the little wooden cage, where the youngest child, still too young to sit alone, was for two long hours an infant prisoner.

Primitive as was the church, the congregation also retained its Puritan aspect, as they arrived, one family after the other, from their old farm-houses among the hills. The wife, the sister, or the betrothed, dismounted at the old oaken block, close to the meeting-house door, from behind her cavalier; and the old family horse patiently took his position outside, till the long service was over. The old sexton in the porch, rope in hand, and arrayed in his cocked hat, waited anxiously for the pastor; when, quitting the bell, he preceded him, hat in hand, to the pulpit stairs, and then, when the door was closed, respectfully

took his seat. All these ancient customs passed away from our manners even before the Puritan meeting-houses disappeared from the landscape." — pp. 140, 141.

It seems strange now to think of this extraordinary young man, in the flush of his earliest reputation, preaching his first sermon, at the age of twenty, under circumstances like these. But such were the times ; and, as we have intimated, Mrs. Lee's sketches of them are drawn with an artist-like skill, which brings out her principal figures with excellent effect ; — one of them, as a type of the New England clergy of the last century, marked by the lights and shades that distinguished it when presented with its better attributes ; — the other no less decisively a type of the coming changes.

The elder Buckminster was born at Rutland, Massachusetts, in 1751, — a Hebrew of the Hebrews, — the son of a Puritan clergyman and of a Puritan clergyman's daughter. He was educated at Yale College, where his classical studies were so thoroughly pursued, that the power of speaking and writing Latin was never entirely lost, but where he passed through one of those terrible seasons of conversion which darken Calvinism, even in its less severe forms, and which left deep traces in his susceptible spirit through the rest of his life. He was ordained as a clergyman at Portsmouth, over the most considerable congregation in New Hampshire, in 1779, — his age being then nearly the same with that at which his gifted son was afterwards suddenly taken from the midst of his labors, — and he died in the year 1812, after a ministry of above thirty-three years.

As to his religious opinions we can have no doubt. We have his creed, above four pages in length (pp. 19–23), drawn up at about the time he was settled ; and from which, so far as we can judge, he never afterwards materially swerved. It is thoroughly Calvinistic, — formed upon the theory, that God was offended with man for the sin of the fall, and that, therefore, God must suffer in order to restore to the Divine favor those who, from all eternity, had been chosen to receive it ; that none can obtain this favor except by a faith wholly the gift of God ; and that those to whom it has once been vouchsafed cannot ultimately fail of its blessed benefits. On the basis of this creed, and with a sincere persuasion that it was the only safe founda-

tion of hope for his hearers or for himself, Dr. Buckminster preached, during his whole life, to the people of his charge ; devoting himself faithfully to their service, and refusing every temptation to give his thoughts or his cares to any rival object.

But though he did this with an absolute fidelity to his own convictions of duty, we are not to suppose that the sermons he preached, or the doctrines he inculcated, produced the effect then that they would produce now. A great gulf separates those times from ours. In those days, controversy, as we now understand it and feel it, was not. Orthodox and Liberal, Calvinist and Unitarian, as Mrs. Lee truly says, were not then the watchwords of party. Even Episcopalians and Puritans had ceased, for a time, to be at open feud. When the congregation of St. John's Church at Portsmouth was without a rector, Dr. Buckminster was sometimes asked to minister to them ; and when their consecrated edifice was destroyed by the fire of 1806, they kept their Christmas, the next day, in Dr. Buckminster's unanointed meeting-house, and he spoke to them words of consolation which were not lost upon their hearts in a season of public and private calamity. In those days, there was little inquiry into doctrines, and hardly a trace of inquisition into the opinions of individuals. Some discussion there undoubtedly was, in consequence of the springing up of the great sects of the Baptists and Methodists, and, occasionally, not a little defection from the old Calvinistic congregations ; but the technical views of these leading parties in religion were so nearly alike, that it was hard to make out a case of controversy in which the community could be induced to take a great interest.

Preaching, in consequence, was a different thing then from what it is now. Dr. Buckminster's sermons were composed on the old Connecticut model ; each containing a part, and often the whole, of the author's system of divinity, illustrated and supported by ample quotations from Scripture, and concluded by practical reflections, which often had little real connection with the formulary of doctrine that had preceded them, and little relation to the wants and condition of the particular congregation addressed. But nine tenths of the preachers of New England offered nothing else to their hearers, and the uniformity of such doctrinal discourses produced at least one beneficial effect. The churches had



rest. The sermons might be dull, — and, in general, that was their prominent characteristic, — or they might be acute and metaphysical, which was the distinction at which they chiefly aimed ; but it was very rare that they were levelled at any but the audience to which they were preached ; it was very rare that an unkind spirit was awakened by them in the hearers ; it was still more rare that they infected the peace of neighbourhoods or families. Even the discussion between the followers of Hopkins and the Calvinists of the old school, or that in which both of them contended with the Baptists, cannot properly be regarded as constituting an exception to this remark. For the former, growing out of the metaphysics of Edwards, while it was quite too refined and deep to be fairly comprehended by many even of the clergy who entered into it, had too little effervescence in its nature to excite the mass of their congregations ; and the latter, founded on an obvious external rite, though it gained much favor with the less cultivated, to whom, at first, its claims were chiefly addressed, seemed to go too far in the other extreme, and failed to call forth anything like a spirit of controversy and bitterness in the community. Of philological learning to interpret the Scriptures, or elegance of style to illustrate Christianity and its precepts, there was hardly a thought. The few who sought to commend themselves to their people, by anything but the soundness of their theology, sought to do it generally by earnestness and vehemence of elocution.

It was in a state of society like this, and especially under strong influences from the state of New England theology and preaching, such as we have described it to have been, that the younger Buckminster was born in Portsmouth, in 1784, and that the important years of his early youth were passed. From the first, he showed an uncommon tendency to intellectual pursuits. He loved books as soon as he could comprehend them ; and, to please him, he was taught to read a chapter in the Greek Testament before he could be taught the language itself. But his religious tendencies were even more strongly marked. From five to seven years old, he used to read sermons and sing hymns with the servants of the family on Sundays, and he did it so gravely and so sweetly as to command their attention and love. All this, it will be observed, — so far as the development of his faculties and tastes was concerned, — was connected with his condition as the son of a clergyman faithfully devoted to

his duties, and possessing somewhat more of scholarlike accomplishments than were then common among his class in New England. At the age of eleven, he passed from the immediate care of his father, and from the instructions of an uncle, who was his schoolmaster, and entered Exeter Academy, where the direct religious influences of his residence in the family of a clergyman, whose Calvinistic opinions were more severe than those to which he had been accustomed, were substantially the same. But, in other respects, his relations were improved. He read books and heard of studies before unknown to him. He began to think less of the immediate and the present, and more of the future. Among other things that naturally occupied much of his concern, was the question, how and where he should continue his studies, when he should leave his present situation. At Exeter, boys were prepared, and carefully prepared, for all the New England colleges, as well as for active life; and long before each left the temporary home, which to few of them had been other than a happy one, the position for which he was next destined, its merits and its disadvantages, were often discussed with his fellows, with the freedom and earnestness that belong to youth. Dr. Buckminster, as might have been foreseen, desired that his son should be educated at New Haven, where he had been educated himself, and where he had passed eleven useful and active years. But the son's inclinations were different. He had read Homer and Virgil; he had become interested in ancient history; his literary tastes were already so eager, that, beginning to read Boswell's Johnson, while leaning on a mantel-piece, he forgot himself so long and so completely, that he did not move till he fainted from exhaustion. These strong tendencies, so early and so decisively developed, led him to select Cambridge, where classical and literary studies have always been pursued with so fond a preference. The father feared the views of religion which he supposed to prevail there, and expressed his apprehensions to his son. But the wishes of the winning and affectionate boy prevailed; and in 1797, when he was only thirteen years old, he was admitted as a Sophomore at the college of his preference, and in the society of several young friends, to whom, by similarity of pursuits and sympathy of tastes, he was already attached.

His life there was a happy one. The pecuniary means

for an indulgence even of his love of books were, indeed, wanting. The meagre salary of his father could afford no luxuries to the child of his fondest affections ; but the rigorous economy to which he had always been accustomed, and his strong love of study, prevented poverty from being felt as a serious restraint. It was, therefore, a small thing to him to wear poor clothes and be obliged to walk a part of his journeys home in vacation, in order to save expense. He had higher thoughts. Every step in his college course was onward and upward, and filled him with animation and alacrity. Those who remember most of him at this period recollect the attractive personal beauty which, a few years earlier, had led a gentleman and lady, accidentally passing through Portsmouth, to follow him home, and ask that he might be given to them for a son ; — they recollect his fervent devotion to study, and not only to such study as was prescribed by the rules of the college, but to such as involved a wide course of reading in history and elegant literature ; — and they recollect, above all, the deep sense of duty which controlled alike his ardent and his tender feelings, his prejudices and his passions, to a degree that could hardly have been expected from one so young, surrounded by solicitations to pleasure before entirely unknown to him. When he was graduated in 1800, only a few weeks more than sixteen years old, there is no doubt that he was the object of a more general regard, that he was more admired and loved, than any of his time in college ; and his performance at Commencement, marked by that grace which never deserted him, made an impression not forgotten at the end of half a century by those who then listened to him.

From Cambridge, he went almost directly to Exeter, where, to the great pleasure of his father, he received the place of Assistant Teacher in the Academy, and where he continued above two years. Certainly, he was very young for the task of teaching persons many of whom were older than he was, and one of whom, Mr. Webster, has since filled so large a space in the affairs of the world. But he was equal to the duties his place brought with it, and happy in them. He went over the rudimentary parts of his education, and settled firmly in his mind the foundations for a life of study ; he read much, variously, and well ; and he began upon a wise system, and with deep reverence, the study of the Bible, as the first distinct step in his preparation

for the profession to which he had always intended to devote his life.

His residence in Exeter was important to him in another point of view. It was the period when, if not from his years, at least from his position, he ceased to be a boy, and became part of a society much older than himself. In this he was fortunate. The village in which the Academy had been placed was a pleasant one; full of intelligence, and of a cultivation rare, at that time, in any part of the country. The head of the institution, Dr. Abbott, a careful student, and a wise and prudent man, with a wider and more generous circumspection than any other teacher of a similar condition in New England; — the late Chief Justice Smith, one of the most acute and affluent minds of his time; — Governor Gilman and his cultivated and delightful family; — Judge Peabody, a gentleman of the old school, whose children have since ornamented society wherever they have been known, in the highest positions as in the most laborious, at the courts of foreign princes and as Christian ministers at home; — these, and others, formed by their intercourse, and fitted to be associated with them by their accomplishments, constituted a society in whose healthy and invigorating atmosphere his character took an impulse and received a direction which it never afterwards lost.

His residence of above two years at Exeter was followed by one of nearly equal length in the family of his kinsman, Mr. Theodore Lyman, as a private teacher of the two sons of that gentleman; — a position as favorable to his studies, and to his social privileges and enjoyments, as could perhaps have been selected for him anywhere in this community.

But it was, as is so often the case, precisely when the external circumstances were the most favorable and happy, that the real trials of life began. At Exeter he suffered the first attack of the terrible malady — epilepsy — that ten years afterwards destroyed him; and amidst the rural peace of the delicious retreat at Waltham began the discussion with his father on the controverted questions of theology, and especially those of the Trinity and the Atonement, which at one time had wellnigh prevented him from assuming the ministerial office, and never ceased to disturb, and in some degree to embitter, his life.

But, from the outset, Mr. Buckminster took the position he always maintained afterwards, and one from which, we



are persuaded, no change of times or conflict of parties would have induced him to advance or recede. He placed himself on the impregnable Protestant ground of the Bible, authenticated by miracles, as the only binding creed, and the only rule of faith and practice, and on the right and therefore the duty of private judgment in everything relating to its interpretation. It was a bold ground to be assumed by one so young ; but he never felt, for an instant, that it was an unsafe or an uncertain one.

There were then no theological schools in the United States, and students in divinity, on the old Congregational platform, commonly placed themselves in the family of some well-reputed clergyman of their own faith, who, after directing their studies for what was deemed a reasonable length of time, offered them, on his personal responsibility, to the association of ministers with which he happened to be connected ; and if that body gave the candidate thus presented their approbation, he was accounted as one "licensed to preach." The system was evidently very imperfect, so far as instruction was concerned ; and as to the authority of the association, it was certainly not founded on the ancient examples of New England independence, and, in our judgment, was equally deficient in wisdom and in beneficent results. Mr. Buckminster's father, however, was inclined to have him pursue this method of preparation, especially after his son's orthodoxy had become uncertain ; hoping, no doubt, by a careful supervision of his faith, to reclaim him from the course on which he seemed entering. But the young man was faithful to his convictions of duty. He was aware that some of his doctrinal opinions were unsettled, but he had determined, with much deliberation, by what process alone he could conscientiously settle them ; and he went on his way with firmness, though certainly not without sorrow and misgiving in consequence of the anxious opposition of one he so much loved.

For such a course his new relations in life were favorable. He was able to earn his bread, and was therefore thus far independent. He was in the neighbourhood of the amplest collection of books, for purposes like his, that could be found in the country. His reputation and promise gave him the means of intercourse with the best minds in this part of New England, on terms which, considering his youth, were remarkably equal. He had no doubts about the truth or the

miraculous origin and authority of Christianity, whose evidences, already faithfully examined by him, he had gladly accepted and publicly acknowledged. He therefore now turned to an earnest and conscientious inquiry into its doctrines. He read whatever was deemed most important on both sides of the controverted questions ; he discussed with his father, in a manly and frank spirit, but with all the deference due to his father's age and situation, the points that separated them ; he studied the Scriptures in a devout spirit, but in a spirit of faithful, rigorous criticism ; and the result was, that he entirely rejected the Calvinistic system.

After some further doubt and hesitation, in consequence of the opposition which this final decision brought upon him, he began to preach. His first sermon, as we have noticed, was delivered in the old meeting-house at York, where a venerable relative, much broken by the infirmities of age, still ministered to his primitive people ; and it is a circumstance not without significance, that the young man, on this his first appearance, corrected a phrase in the received version as he read the passage containing it, and that the elder instantly restored the common reading by repeating it in a full voice, with the authority which, he thought, was demanded by the occasion.

But even after he had thus begun to preach, the misgivings of the son were renewed by the increased morbid feelings of the father ; and at one moment it was even uncertain whether he would not still give up a profession for which he seemed to be singularly fitted by his character, his talents, and his tastes. At last, however, with the parental assent, he again returned to his public duties, and in October, 1804, he delivered his first sermon in Brattle Street. There was no doubt as to the effect he produced, and no hesitation as to inviting him to become the permanent minister of that truly metropolitan church and society. On the 30th of January, 1805, therefore, he was regularly ordained ; and from that moment his career became a public one. The state of his health, indeed, once or twice interrupted or checked it, and the fearful malady that finally brought his life to a close made its insidious attacks at uncertain intervals, but with sure results. At the suggestion of his parish, who hoped thus to prolong a life which they early learned to value as a great blessing to them and to their children, he made an excursion to Europe, and was absent from May,

1806, to September, 1807, during which time he visited England, Holland, France, and Switzerland, forming many pleasant acquaintances, and enriching his mind with the observation and knowledge that come peculiarly from foreign travel. But, though he was much refreshed by the release from labor which this interval of relaxation afforded him, and though he returned invigorated in his general health, the peculiar malady, whose inroads he had suffered for five years, had relaxed nothing of its hold upon his constitution.

From January, 1805, to June, 1812, with the exception of this interval of eighteen months spent in Europe, and a few weeks of acute illness, Mr. Buckminster was an active clergyman in Boston. The period was certainly short, — about five years and a half; and when to this we add his youth, — for he was ordained four months before he was twenty-one years old, — we may well be surprised at the results he produced, and the space he filled in the interests and regard of the community. To these we will now turn.

Mr. Buckminster was first known among us as a scholar. No young man, we believe, of whom the memory remains to us, produced the effect he did in college, and in the years immediately following those of college life. His extraordinary personal beauty, and his frank, open manners, bespoke the favor of all who saw him; and the peculiarly sweet tones of his voice were a fit accompaniment to the graceful thoughts he uttered in words that seemed sometimes to be spoken under a strong and sudden impulse, but were always remarkably select and appropriate. His classical studies were early of a higher order than was then customary. His delicate and sensitive taste kept even pace with his knowledge, and made it certain that his direction was right. Men much older than himself — men upon whom rested the burdens of the State — paused, amid their anxious labors, to take notice of one unlike all they had known at the corresponding period of their own training. At sixteen, he was already marked by many, as one destined to extraordinary success, — marked, too, it should be remembered, for the attributes both of mind and of character that distinguished him to the last, and on which his name and honors still rest.

As he advanced, his course became more obvious, and was more distinct and well defined. The boy who had read Homer for his pleasure continued to pursue, as a man, the classical studies which constitute so much of the discipline

needful for those who would think with exactness, and use their own language correctly and gracefully. But he soon found that books were wanting to him. The idea of printing the Greek and Roman classics was not yet entertained in the United States. Even of the poorest and commonest manuals, including grammars and dictionaries, nearly all were imported from Europe as late as 1800, the year he was graduated. A translation of Cicero's *Cato Major* — made by the venerable James Logan, a Scotch gentleman educated in England, and subsequently the founder of the Loganian Library at Philadelphia, — which was published in a thin quarto volume in 1744, by no less a person than Benjamin Franklin — was the best and almost the only effort that had been made in the United States before the present century to translate any ancient classic, and it had been long forgotten, when Mr. Buckminster revived the memory of it by a pleasant notice in the *Monthly Anthology* for 1808. Sallust, printed at Salem in 1805, in a modest duodecimo, and praised by Mr. Buckminster, as it deserved to be, the same year in the same *Review*, was the first attempt made in the United States to print an edition of a classical author, with anything like original notes and illustrations.\* He had therefore no resources in the press of his own country.

---

\* The Sallust printed at Salem in 1805 is a duodecimo volume of 276 pages. It was edited by two scholars, who desired no other reward for their labors than the pleasure of rendering a service to the cause of letters in their country, and of affording a useful manual to the youth about to be admitted to Harvard College, where the reading of Sallust had just before been required as a preparatory study. One of these scholars was Mr. John Pickering, who had already passed some time in Europe, partly in travelling on the Continent, and partly as private secretary to Mr. King, our Minister Plenipotentiary in England. The other was Mr. Daniel Appleton White, who had recently been Latin Tutor in Harvard College. Both, at the time they assumed the pleasant task of preparing this "editio emendatior," were students at law in the office of Mr. Samuel Putnam, a distinguished counsellor in Salem, and afterwards a Judge of the Supreme Court of Massachusetts. The Preface was written by Mr. Pickering, and is modest, as was his whole life; the selection, composition, and arrangement of the notes, and the general supervision of the press, fell to both alike. The edition, in its selected as well as in its original portions, does honor to the two gentlemen who prepared it; one of whom, Mr. White, a judge of one of our courts of law, has survived his friend and coadjutor, and offered a beautifully faithful tribute to his memory as a jurist, a scholar, and a man worthy of all praise, in a Eulogy delivered before the American Academy, of which Mr. Pickering, at the time of his death, was President. The little Sallust, edited by these two young friends, and soon forgotten amidst the cares and honors that awaited them in life, was published by Cushing & Appleton of Salem; the latter of whom was graduated at Harvard College in 1792. But, soon after its appearance, nearly the



This compelled him to look abroad. As soon as he had means, he sent to Europe and purchased such books as he needed ; and when he was there as a traveller for health, possessing a small fund which he had inherited from his grandfather Stevens, he expended a large part of it in stores for his library. On this point of accumulating books, he had a strong feeling nearly akin to a sense of duty ; and used words about it such as were not heard in his time from anybody else among us. In a letter, dated London, May 5, 1807, after alluding to the apprehension he entertained that his memory might have begun to fail, under the terrible malady which seemed always to be stretched like a dark cloud over his hopes, he writes to his father : —

“ You will perhaps say, that it is no very strong proof that I have any serious apprehensions on this score, that I am continually purchasing and sending out books, and saying to my mind, ‘Thou hast goods laid up for many years.’ True ; — but though I may be cut off by the judgment of God from the use of these luxuries, they will be a treasure to those who succeed me, like the hoards of a miser scattered after his death. I consider, that, by every book I send out, I do something for my dear country, which the love of money seems to be depressing almost into unlettered barbarism.”

The consequence of all this was, that, in the latter years of his life, he had a library, not indeed large, as libraries are now counted, but really rich and select, — better than any other in the country on the subjects to which he had especially devoted his inquiries, and always open to those who desired to use it as such a collection of books ought to be used. It was the largest and by far the best private library that had then been brought together in this part of America. It set the decisive example which has since been followed so well. And it is not too much to say, that from that library, and the spirit that dwelt and wrought in it, — from the influence of its possessor on the young men of his time, and from the encouraging facilities he gave them to pursue studies for which it was difficult and sometimes impossible

---

whole edition was destroyed by fire ; and, in consequence of this accident, a copy of it has now become so rare, that it was with difficulty we procured one to revive our recollection of its merits. Besides the notice by Mr. Buckminster already mentioned, which is in the *Monthly Anthology*, Vol. II., 1805, p. 549, the original *Prospectus* by Mr. Pickering may be found in the *Literary Miscellany*, Cambridge, 1805, Vol. I. p. 198.

elsewhere to procure fitting means, — it is not, in our judgment, too much to say, that the impulse still felt in the pursuit of classical accomplishments in Boston and its neighbourhood is to be traced to that spot, rather than to any other in New England.

But, as Mr. Thacher has well said, in his beautiful and affectionate memoir of the friend he survived so few years, "it was the light which philology pours on the records of our faith and hope, which gave it its chief value in the mind of Mr. Buckminster." This, in fact, was — from the time he felt assured of the truth of Christianity as a miraculous revelation — the starting-point of his theological studies ; and the course on which he then entered was never interrupted till the moment when he was so suddenly summoned from the midst of his labors. For, the fact of such a revelation having been once settled in his mind, the only important questions that remained open to him, either as to the doctrines it enforced or as to the character of the teaching it implied, regarded the genuineness of the different parts of its records, and the meaning to be attached to the whole of them.

To determine, as far as he could, these grave questions, was undoubtedly the great end and object of his scholarship. For this purpose, he collected, in order to illustrate the Scriptures in their original languages, and especially in order to illustrate the New Testament, an *apparatus criticus* unequalled, at that time, on any part of the American continent. He devoted himself earnestly to the study of Biblical criticism, and when he had made a progress in it such as was then thought desirable by hardly anybody else among us, he encouraged and assisted others to enter on the same course. It was owing to him, more than to anybody else, that his friend, Mr. William Wells, was able to publish, in 1809, a reprint of Griesbach's Manual New Testament ; — the first instance of a Greek book printed in the United States with great care and accuracy, and, as we suppose, still the only instance in which a Greek book, printed in Germany, and reprinted here before its appearance in England, was ordered from the American publishers to supply the demands of British scholars. It was he who, in the Boston Monthly Anthology,\* first discussed subjects of Bib-

---

\* We should be glad to think that justice will ever be done to the "Monthly Anthology and Boston Review," as the pioneer to that better scholarship and more generous spirit of inquiry which, we hope, may be said

lical criticism in a spirit of philosophical and pains-taking learning, and who, more than his other friends, encouraged Mr. Norton to take the advanced tone of inquiry implied by

now to have obtained a firm foothold in New England. But, probably, this will never happen, — so few persons are there among the living, who recollect the circumstances under which that journal first appeared, or who will make such allowances as ought to be made for it in consequence of the difficulties it afterwards encountered, during a period of great discouragement, both as to our public relations and private welfare and prosperity.

Its first number was printed at Boston, in November, 1803, and was edited by Mr. Phineas Adams, a graduate of Harvard College two years earlier. But Mr. Adams, partly from his youth, and partly from other circumstances, was little fitted for the task he had assumed, and, in his hands, the experiment failed at the end of six months. In May, 1804, it appeared under the management of the Rev. William Emerson, pastor of the First Church in Boston, whose many cares soon forced him to transfer the superintendence of the Anthology to Mr. Samuel C. Thacher, afterwards so much known and loved among us. Both of these gentlemen naturally interested as many literary friends as they could in their undertaking, and meetings were soon held, especially at the houses of Mr. Emerson and of Dr. John S. J. Gardiner, Rector of Trinity Church, a frank, warm-hearted gentleman, and a good scholar, who owed some of his early training to Dr. Parr of Hatton. At last, in order to give greater consistency and efficiency to their labors, a club was formed; a constitution was adopted; and all subsidiary arrangements were made, that seemed needful for a more active management of the Anthology, and a wider diffusion of its influence. From October 3, 1805, regular records were kept, and regular meetings held, until July 2, 1811, when the disasters of the times, united with other causes, destroyed the Anthology, as they did so much else that was then germinating in our community; — the last number having been published at the end of June, with a farewell address by Mr. Thacher.

Considering all the circumstances of its career, the Anthology Club may perhaps be said to have had a somewhat long life. Certainly it had a most pleasant one. Dr. Gardiner was its President almost to the last, and was succeeded by Dr. Kirkland. Mr. Arthur Maynard Walter, whose early death is noticed with such tenderness and eloquence by Mr. Buckminster, in his Discourse before the Phi Beta Kappa Society, was one of its most efficient members, and Mr. Buckminster himself was another. Besides these, Mr. S. C. Thacher; Mr. Emerson; Mr. William Tudor, subsequently the founder of the North American Review, and our Minister to Brazil; Mr. Alexander H. Everett, who, after serving his country with ability and honor in Holland, Belgium, and Spain, died as its representative in China; Mr. McKean, Professor of Rhetoric and Oratory in Harvard College, — wrote much for its pages, and sustained it faithfully. All these scholars and gentlemen, with others like them, a few of whom still survive, constituted a most agreeable society, whose weekly suppers, generally protracted to a very late hour, were rendered interesting by the scholarlike discussions they naturally called forth, and gay by the genial humor of more than one of the members thus brought together, and the uncommon social resources of nearly all. The responsibility of conducting the Anthology rested, of course, on the shoulders of the gentlemen composing this little club, which rarely collected more than six or eight members round its cheerful board, and never went beyond fifteen. But they were assisted by friends abroad, who added much to their strength; — by Mr. John Lowell, Mr. John Pickering, the two Presidents Adams, father and son, Mr. Fisher Ames, Chief Justice Smith of New Hampshire, and Chief Justice Parker of Massachusetts,

the publication of the *General Repository and Review*, whose first numbers only he lived to welcome. It was he who, by the consent of all, was appointed first lecturer on the foundation laid in Harvard College, by the elder Mr. Dexter, to promote the knowledge of sacred literature ; — a duty which he assumed only a year before his death, and for which he was earnestly preparing himself when he was suddenly cut off. In short, it was he who first took the critical study of the Scriptures among us from the old basis, on which it had rested during the Arminian discussions of the latter part of the last century and the beginning of the present one, when little more learning was thought needful than could be found in such books as Macknight on the Epistles and Campbell on the Gospels, and placed it on the solid foundations of the text of the New Testament as settled by Wetstein and Griesbach, and elucidated by the labors of Michaelis, Marsh, and Rosenmüller, and by the safe and wise learning of Grotius, Le Clerc, and Simon. It has, in our opinion, hardly been permitted to any other man to render so considerable a service as this to Christianity in the Western World.

---

Dr. Bowditch, Mr. Justice Story, Dr. John Eliot, Professor Frisbie, Mr. Allston, Mr. Haven of Portsmouth, and others among the dead as well as among the living, whose names might fitly be associated with theirs. But no single individual labored with more interest for the *Anthology* than did Mr. Buckminster; and none, considering his many urgent duties and his uncertain health, rendered it such effective service. Above forty of its articles — some of them of great value, and many showing a learning then little known among us — are from his pen. His name appears, at the opening of the records of the club, as that of one of the first persons who offered the contributions to which they bear witness ; it occurs again in the same way, as the very last on their closing pages ; and there now lies before us a complete set of the *Anthology*, which, just before his death, he caused to be bound with care, and in which, on leaves inserted for the purpose, in each volume, he intended to write a history of the publication, and of the club of friends that managed it. Indeed, he was always active in whatever concerned its interests, and always anxious to make it useful to the progress of a liberal and sound scholarship. It was at his earnest solicitation that a department for retrospective reviews of American literature was established, and it was he that wrote both the notice introducing it to the public in January, 1808, and several of its more important articles ; all which had much influence in reviving a knowledge of old American books, and of old books relating to America. And when, somewhat earlier, — in May, 1805, and at subsequent meetings, — under the leading of Mr. William Smith Shaw, one of the members of the club, arrangements were made for establishing the “*Anthology Reading Room*,” which two years afterwards became the “*Boston Athenæum*,” no one gave more active assistance to the project of his friend than Mr. Buckminster ; — an assistance which, as we see from Mrs. Lee’s life, was very important while he was in Europe, and which, as we know, was continued in other ways to the moment of his death.



But Mr. Buckminster's great popular success was where his friends expected and hoped that it would be ; — we mean as a public teacher of the religion of Jesus Christ. From the first sermon he preached at Brattle Street to the last, delivered by him only ten days before his death, no man stood between him and the general respect and admiration of this community. During the five or six years which, excluding his absence in Europe, constituted the entire term of his ministry, he was, beyond all question, the most popular and effective preacher in New England. Dr. Freeman, a man remarkable for his integrity and simplicity, for his candor and faithfulness, for his clear, vigorous thought, and the beautiful transparency of his style of writing, had, when Mr. Buckminster was ordained, preached for nearly twenty years at King's Chapel with so little general effect, that, notwithstanding the veneration felt by his congregation for his virtues and talents, their number had not been perceptibly increased. Dr. Kirkland, at the same period, had been settled nearly eleven years at Church Green, and his sermons, full of intellectual wealth and practical wisdom, with sometimes a quaintness that bordered on humor, had yet never been inspired by the peculiar genius of pulpit eloquence, and, while they had satisfied and gratified minds of the highest order, had, especially from a defect of manner in their delivery, fallen with little power on the multitude. Mr. Emerson, transplanted to the First Church in Boston six years before Mr. Buckminster's settlement, possessed, on the contrary, a graceful and dignified style of speaking, which was by no means without its attraction ; but he lacked the fervor that could rouse the many, and the original resources that could command the few. And Dr. Channing, four years older than Mr. Buckminster, had been ordained a year and a half over the very small society in Federal Street, which his extraordinary gifts afterwards made so large ; but he was struggling with feeble health, and with a sensitive, conscientious spirit, which cast a shade over his great powers, and prevented them from taking effect on the community which, in time, he leavened with so much of his spirit, or from being known at all to the country at large, which now so widely acknowledges his power. Except these four distinguished preachers, however, there was not one in New England who could come into competition with Mr. Buckminster, when he entered the ministry ; — not one with whom he would

naturally measure himself ; not one with whom he would be measured by others.

But he was as different from all of them as they were from each other. His beautiful, beaming countenance was eloquent for him before his lips were opened. His rich, flexible voice ; his gracious manner, natural almost to carelessness ; his solemnity and earnestness, especially in his devotional exercises, — all were felt deep in the hearts of all who listened to him. Sure we are, that those who once heard him will never lose the impression of his peculiar style of elocution, for they have heard nothing like it since ; — so remarkable was it for a union of sweetness and solemnity.

As a preacher, he was very bold. He lived in days of much trial, when, in consequence of commercial restrictions, this city, which was then almost entirely dependent on foreign trade, was much reduced in its wealth ; and when not a few in all conditions of its society were exposed to temptations which had not approached them in the days of their prosperity, and which, happily, we have not since been called to encounter. To such Mr. Buckminster spoke with great plainness, — sometimes with a plainness distasteful to many of his congregation, who, if not implicated in the commercial irregularities of the time, yet shared in the general suffering, and could not willingly hear men rebuked, in whose unmerited misfortunes they deeply sympathized. Some traces of this Christian courage are found in his published works ; — many more must lie buried among the faithful practical discourses in which he every Sunday explained to his people their commonest duties, and which, if they have now less literary value and general interest, were not at the time less effective or important than the rest.

In the same way, he spoke with great freedom and plainness when he touched on the political divisions of society. Party spirit then ran very high. Since the time of the Revolution, it has never been so bitter or so violent as it was in the four or five years immediately preceding the war of 1812. Many men among us, during that disastrous period, felt that they were struggling for their subsistence, — for the home-comforts of those dearest to them, — for the order and well-being of society. Mr. Buckminster sympathized with them in their hard trials, and, in the main, his opinions were like theirs ; but he countenanced none of their excesses, and shared none of their bitterness. When Gov-

ernor Sullivan died in office, during the crisis of the commercial restrictions which he and his party had supported, and which were then breaking down whatever was most valued in New England, Mr. Buckminster rendered him a tribute of just praise, which was, no doubt, unwelcome to the great majority of those who heard it, but which was paid in sincerity, and showed alike his courage and his reverence for the truth. No one of those who then heard him, as he preached from the text, "None of us liveth for himself," will ever forget the tones of his voice, the solemnity of his manner, the faithfulness of his rebuke, when, turning from the mourners to the crowd and to the occasion, he said,—

"My hearers, you have come up hither to listen to the praises of the dead; I have gained my purpose, if you retire with the conviction, how empty are the praises of a mortal. The ear is deaf which once heard me; the tongue of the orator is motionless; the lips cold and rigid on which persuasion hung; and the hand which held the pen, and bore the sword and staff of office, fast clenched in death. And, having seen all this, can you go away, and think of anything but God? Can you forget, in an instant, the inexpressible vanity of this world's honors? They have only dressed up another victim for the tomb. We have bestowed upon the departed all that man had to bestow; the pomp of procession, the spectacle of numbers, the solemn knell of departed dignity, the noise of military honors, the pageant of a funeral, tears, prayers, condolence, the decorated coffin, the long inviolated tomb,—all, all was to be found, but him on whom these honors were bestowed. Every eye and ear were sensible to this respect but his to whom it was paid.

"And now the noise of the crowd has ceased, the pageantry of office has vanished, and the tomb is still; is there nothing left of the loftiest officer of the Commonwealth? Nothing, my friends, of all his honors, but the services which he has rendered to society. What he did for himself is no longer heard of; what he did for others can only embalm him."—*Works*, Boston, 1839, Vol. II. p. 315.

But, every week, he was as faithful as he was on the gravest and most imposing occasions;—often he was more eloquent and powerful;—for it was the greatness of truth that animated him, and not the greatness of anything in the course of human events. Indeed, it was frequently said, that he was less happy in what are called occasional discourses than he was in his customary ministrations;—a remark,

however, which should be subjected to two striking exceptions, — the Discourse before the Female Asylum for Orphans, and the Address to the Phi Beta Kappa Society, — in each of which he produced an effect such as has rarely been witnessed anywhere on similar occasions.

In the first, the text of which was taken from Saint Paul's exhortation to the Philippians, — "Help those women which labored with me in the Gospel," — as he approached the conclusion, after having addressed the orphan children before him, he turned to the multitude that thronged the church on all sides, —

"What remains, then, my Christian hearers, but that you should help these women? I beseech you, in the name of that sex which you profess to admire; in the name of that religion which has given you wives whom you can respect, and children of whom you hope everything, send them not away empty. I beseech you, in the name of these little ones, of whom Jesus would say, 'Suffer these children to come unto me, and forbid them not, for of such is the kingdom of heaven,' — I beseech you, in the venerable name of Jesus himself, the affectionate friend of this sex, who was always ready to lay his hands on their orphans and bless them, — hear what our blessed Lord saith: 'Take heed, that ye cause not one of these little ones to offend'; — how much more, then, to perish! — 'for verily I say unto you, their angels do always behold the face of my Father who is in heaven.' What! their angels do always behold the face of God? Perhaps, then, they are witnesses of this scene. Perhaps they will carry up with them to their blessed seats the story of this hour's bounty. Perhaps they may consent to join in the songs of thanksgiving which we send up to the ear of the Most High, in joy of this day's charity. Do you say that these are only illusions of a heated or a benevolent fancy? Be it so. But this, at least, is certain, that, in a very few years, these orphans will themselves bid adieu to this world and its neglect, to this world and their benefactors. Children! may you carry with you to heaven the remembrance of this day's goodness; or, if your hopes and mine should now be disappointed, plead for us, dear children, at the feet of the God of mercy, and obtain our pardon from the Father of the fatherless, and the widow's Friend." — *Works*, Boston, 1839, Vol. 1. pp. 411, 412.

As he spoke these stirring words, a solemn movement was perceptible through the assembly; and when, a few moments afterwards, the vast crowd that had listened to him



broke up, and was returning home in a silence unwonted on such occasions, it was plain that an impression had been left on their hearts, such as is rarely produced by eloquence of any kind, and never, except when, with the force of some great truth, it appeals through the imagination to some great principle of our common nature.

A similar effect — so far as a merely literary festival could afford an occasion for it — was witnessed during his address to the Phi Beta Kappa Society. His subject, chosen with a happiness granted only to genius, was “The Dangers and the Duties of Men of Letters”; and his rebuke of superficial education and of the love of party notoriety, as distinguished from the love of country; his admirable comparison of Cicero — generously active in public affairs, and yet bearing the full fruits of a true love of letters — with Atticus, who scorned the service of the state from Epicurean selfishness, and died and left no record of his graceful genius; his warning to the young to sanctify their learning with religion and devote it to the cause of truth and human improvement; — all these, and indeed all the other striking passages with which it abounded, were received with a turbulent rapture, which, after the lapse of forty years, does not permit us to regard it as anything less than the most brilliant and successful *merely literary* discourse ever delivered in New England. What a burst of applause followed the words he spoke, when he addressed himself to the foul spirit of party, which, in that age of overbearing faction, carried captive the most promising young spirits of the time, and which, alas, in our own more quiet days, seems to have lost little of its baser attractions, if it have parted with something of its earlier insolence!

“Everywhere there are dangers and evils, of which some affect the intellectual improvement, and others are unfavorable to the moral worth of literary men. In this country, especially, it too often happens, that the young man, who is to live by his talents, and to make the most of the name of a scholar, is tempted to turn his literary credit to the quickest account, by early making himself of consequence to the people, or rather to some of their factions. From the moment that he is found yielding himself up to their service, or hunting after popular favor, his time, his studies, and his powers, yet in their bloom, are all lost to learning. Instead of giving his days and nights to the study of the profound masters of political wisdom, instead of patiently

receiving the lessons of history and of practical philosophy, he prematurely takes a part in all the dissensions of the day. His leisure is wasted on the profligate productions of demagogues, and his curiosity bent on the minutiae of local politics. The consequence is, that his mind is so much dissipated, or his passions disturbed, that the quiet speculations of the scholar can no longer detain him. He hears, at a distance, the bustle of the Comitia, he rushes out of the grove of Egeria, and Numa and the Muses call after him in vain." — *Works*, Boston, 1839, Vol. II. pp. 345, 346.

His bright and beautiful features, transfigured with enthusiasm as he uttered these glowing words, and his eager manner, as he leaned forward with the earnestness of his emotions, are still present to us. The very tones of his voice stir us still as with the sound of a trumpet. They sank deep into many hearts; and more than one young spirit, we have reason to think, was, on that day and in that hour, saved from the enthrallment and degradation of party politics and party passions, and consecrated to letters.

It was in the pulpit, however, and in the ordinary exercise of his duties as a public teacher of Christianity, that, as we have intimated, his great effect was produced, and his great influence acknowledged. The highest minds, perhaps, felt most his peculiar power; the originality of his views; his cogent statement of truths which had not before been placed in the same striking light; his union of a vigorous reason and strong, manly sense, on one side, with a rich, graceful power of illustration on the other. But even the less cultivated of those who heard him did not fail to recognize his instinctive sagacity in detecting error, and his apostolic firmness in rebuking sin; his devout earnestness to produce in his hearers a religion of the heart and the life; his catholic spirit, which knew no bitterness, and infused none into the discussions of his time; the daily beauty of his life, which enforced his teachings and fulfilled them, leaving nothing for his friends to regret or conceal, and nothing for those opposed to him to assail; his admirable self-devotion, which, while he saw that he was perhaps standing on the threshold of death, or might be called to linger out a life gloomier than the grave, still prevented him from avoiding any labor, or any sacrifice, however arduous or severe, and strengthened him to walk with gladness in the path of duty, as if neither danger nor darkness were before him.

At last the messenger came, — without such warning as all had feared, and with a crushing blow. Mr. Buckminster died at Boston, on Tuesday, June 9th, 1812, at noon, after a few days' illness ; and his father, who was journeying for his health, died in Vermont, the next morning, without any knowledge of his son's condition, but saying, with almost his last breath, " My son Joseph is dead " ; — adding, when assured that he must have dreamed, " No, I have not slept, nor dreamed ; — he is dead." The effect was electric. However accidental the coincidence might be, and however men might be persuaded that it was so, all acknowledged its strangeness, and few failed to be conscious of its influence.

As we have said, at the beginning of our remarks, the moment when these striking events occurred was one of great public anxiety and depression. Only a few days afterwards, war was declared by the United States against Great Britain, and, for nearly three sad years, the thoughts of men were mainly occupied with the troubles and dangers that inevitably accompanied their exposed condition. There was, therefore, — partly in consequence of this state of things, — a lull in the storm of theological controversy ; or, at least, the warfare of the opposing political parties became so urgent and engrossing, and the fate of more than one generation seemed so much involved in it, that there was less room for religious bitterness, and little willingness on the part of the community to listen to its occasional recriminations.

But the " *odium in longum jaciens* " of Tacitus was still there ; and when peace came to the troubled world, — when the ravages of Bonaparte in Europe were no longer the subject of endless wonder and speculation, and when the minds of men at home ceased to be agitated with alarm for what was most important to their own external condition and to the wellbeing of those nearest to their hearts, — then they seemed to feel, that, with the other luxuries restored to them by peace, they might indulge themselves anew in the luxury of religious animosity. But, whatever may have been the cause, no sooner was one war ended, than the other broke out. The " Liberal Christians," as they were then called, — or, in other words, the Christians of Boston and its neighbourhood, who had long ceased to acknowledge the authority of the Assembly's Shorter Catechism, and now refused to submit themselves to the exclusive and excluding spirit of Calvinism, — had, for some time, been assailed by the party

claiming to be the only Orthodox or Evangelical Christians, and accused of concealing their opinions in a cowardly and hypocritical manner. This railing accusation, made at about the period to which we refer, in forms and in language more offensive than ever, was so injurious in itself, and so wholly unjustifiable in its tone, and in its general statements, that the parties directly denounced did not feel themselves bound by Christian charity or courtesy to submit to it or to its consequences. Dr. Channing, therefore,—a man eminent for moral courage, and one who, earlier, had been reckoned among those inclined to the opinions then called “Evangelical,”—answered the charge in a letter addressed to the Rev. Mr. Thacher, in June 1815, showing its wrongfulness, and exposing the bitter tempers of those who denied to men like Buckminster and Tuckerman the name of Christians and the charity of a Christian fellowship. Replies and rejoinders followed, as a matter of course; and the controversy was carried on with fervor through the period beginning with Mr. Sparks’s ordination at Baltimore, in 1819, and ending soon after the consecration of Dr. Dewey’s church at New York, in 1826;—the period in which Liberal Christianity asserted its rights, and established its influence in those great cities, and so called forth an unwonted degree of zeal and violence from its enemies. This state of things continued, in fact, till after 1830; since which time the fierceness of the attack has died away, or at least has gradually lost much of its unchristian spirit.

But, in the course of this long warfare, the *Labarum* of Liberal Christianity, which Mr. Buckminster had done more than any other man of his time among us to plant on the high ground of the Bible, as interpreted by the private judgment of its Christian readers,—this true standard of the Cross has been removed,—whether by the skilful strategy of its assailants or by the unsound principles of defence adopted by its friends, it is useless here to inquire;—but it has been removed, and it has been planted on the ground of “Unitarianism,” as if the doctrine of the Trinity were the only, or the chief thing, that separates Liberal Christians from Papacy or Calvinism, from the Methodists or the Baptists. This we regard as a misfortune to the great cause it claims to lead on. For, from this time, and in consequence of this movement, the old body of “Liberal Christians” has lost something of its original and kindly comprehensiveness, and



more of its peculiar character. It has become a denomination and a sect, like other denominations and other sects. It has felt obliged, in some degree, to pass without censure, if not to receive into its fellowship, persons who are Unitarians only because they believe in the unity of God, while they deny all miraculous authority to the Christian revelation. It has been placed before the world in a false position, where it is more easily assailed than it ought to be, and where its defences are necessarily rendered weaker by being so much extended, as, on the one side, to include some whom it cannot protect and ought never to countenance, and, on the other, to shut out those generous and independent Christians of the elder school, who are its natural allies, and safe and honorable support.

To such a change Mr. Buckminster, we are persuaded, would never have been a party. His early education; the character of his mind; the sound learning he loved; the devout reverence for the Bible as a miraculous revelation of God's will to man, which he cherished in his heart of hearts, — all would have resisted it, and, as we believe, would have resisted it effectually. Has, then, Christianity — faithful, devout, liberal Christianity — really gained by this change of its position, and by the course which many of its leading friends have pursued, since, thirty-seven years ago, they turned with grieved and broken hearts from the grave of its most brilliant and powerful defender, and assumed the solemn duties cast upon them by his early and sudden death? The next generation will sit in judgment on this question, and will answer it.

G. T.

---

We have great satisfaction in being permitted to add, to the review just closed, the following letter from Professor Norton, written in reply to a request for information on the origin and progress of liberal views of Christianity in New England, and on Mr. Buckminster's relations to them. It has a value and an authority which can be increased by no remarks of ours.

Eds.

MY DEAR SIR :—

I regret that I have been prevented by ill-health from answering your letter before, and I fear that I must answer it now in a way equally unsatisfactory to you and to myself.

As you know, there had been from an early period, I cannot say how early, a resistance to the rigid Calvinism of our forefathers, and to their false conceptions of religion. The authority of their system was broken in upon by the publication of Roger Williams's "Bloody Tenent," in 1644. I cannot from memory trace the history of this resistance. Perhaps—I place no confidence in my recollections—the most important work against the *peculiar doctrines* of Calvinism, which subsequently appeared, was just a century later,—a work published in 1744, entitled, "Grace Defended," by Experience Mayhew, the Indian missionary, and the father of Dr. Jonathan Mayhew. But, from the middle of the last century, there was a considerable and increasing body, both of the clergy and the laity, who rejected with more or less explicitness the doctrines of Calvinism, and modified the doctrine of the Trinity into what has been called "high Arianism," that is, into the proper, ancient, Arian doctrine. The name Arminian soon began to be familiarly used to denote such heretics, often with some epithet of disrespect, as I recollect that my mother has told me that old Dr. Gay of Hingham was called by her grandfather, (Colonel Richmond,) who had no personal ill-will toward him, "a plaguy Arminian." The tendency to separation between the two parties had, indeed, commenced before the middle of the last century, and was increased by the preaching of Whitefield in this country, who arrived for the first time in 1740. His extravagancies and denunciations gave offence, and tended to weaken the credit of his doctrines. The College at Cambridge took the liberal side. The second Professor of Divinity, Dr. Wigglesworth, was not a Calvinist. I cannot speak with confidence, from my own examination, about the opinions of his father, the first Professor, though materials enough exist for ascertaining them, but I believe there is no doubt that he inclined to the Anti-Calvinistic side.

This controversy, as men did not reason in those days from their spiritual intuitions, implied learning, and a critical knowledge of the Scriptures, after the fashion of those times. These studies extended even to the laity, some of whom

were interested in settling their faith for themselves. One of the earliest books which I read relating to the exposition of the Scriptures, many years ago, when quite a young man, was a copy of the original edition of Taylor on the Romans, borrowed from the family of an old gentleman of Hingham, (Colonel John Thaxter, who died in 1802, at the age of eighty-one), which he had formerly recommended and lent to my father.

Besides the main controversy between "the Orthodox" and "liberal Christians," there were other controversies, which kept alive a spirit of inquiry, and attention to theological learning generally, and particularly to the critical study of the Scriptures; such as those respecting Episcopacy, and the doctrine of the final salvation of all men, in both of which Dr. Chauncy particularly distinguished himself.

But if my recollection serves me correctly, there was in the last twenty years of the last century a suspension of controversy between our two great religious parties, a lull in our theological world, broken only by the writings of Hopkins and his followers and opponents, which added nothing to the theological learning of our country. This condition of things was in a great measure produced by the state of public affairs in our own country and in Europe, which engrossed men's thoughts and feelings. Religious opinions were less clearly defined; clergymen, holding, as they conceived, opposite doctrines, did not in all cases feel bound to keep aloof from each other. This state of things continued into the present century; but the truce was soon broken.

One of the first symptoms of the renewed struggle was the appearance of the *Panoplist*, I think in 1804. In that publication I do not recollect anything marked by its learning or its power of general reasoning. It did nothing to promote theological science. But the flame which it was intended to kindle blazed forth on the election of Dr. Ware, who was a liberal Christian in the best sense of the words, and a good theological scholar, to the professorship of divinity in the College. This was in 1805. But the controversy which followed was not managed with extraordinary ability by the liberal party. Through the influence of many causes which rendered the fact natural and excusable, members of that party were not sufficiently explicit in the avowal of their opinions; there was a tendency among them to represent themselves as not essentially disagreeing with their opponents;

and in general, though the superiority of the liberal party in learning was then acknowledged, they wanted the learning necessary to give them assurance in their opinions, and to enable them fully and satisfactorily to explain and defend them. The feelings of resistance in the other party were very strong and active. They denounced their opponents as enemies of the Gospel, and excluded from the hope of salvation. This strong language, which may sound so strangely in our times, is fully supported by the controversial writings of that period. I may refer especially to the different Letters of Dr. Worcester to Mr. Channing, Dr. Worcester having come forward at a later date (in 1815) as a champion of the Orthodox party. The prestige of Orthodoxy continued very powerful, and there were many whose own opinions would have borne no severe test, who yet shrunk from any direct opposition to it. I cannot fix the precise date, but it was after 1805, that I was informed by a young minister, that, on his professing his disbelief of the Trinity, he was told by one of the most distinguished clergymen of Boston, and a most liberal-minded man, that he had better not publicly avow it.

It was in this state of things, in 1805, when he was not yet twenty-one years old, that Mr. Buckminster was ordained as pastor of the society in Brattle Street. In less than eight years, — eight years interrupted by constant ill-health, and by constant labors and avocations connected with his ministry, — he was taken from us. The blossoms and fruits of his mind — ripe fruits — appeared together. I have nothing to add to the opinions I expressed, immediately after his death, in the "General Repository," concerning the influence of his genius, his learning, his whole character, in promoting and giving an impulse to all good literature among us, and especially to the liberal and enlightened study of theology. These opinions were afterwards confirmed by the corresponding views presented in the excellent memoir of him, by his friend and mine, Mr. Thacher. This memoir, and the notices of him in the General Repository, (there were two,) are prefixed to the last edition of his Sermons.

Though I cannot do it without some personal reference to myself, I will go on to mention a few facts which throw light on the state of religious opinion and feeling, and theological learning, during the period of which I have spoken. In 1812,



I published, as editor, the first volume of the *General Repository*. I suppose I need have no hesitation in stating, what was then generally recognized, that in this work the tone of opposition to the prevailing doctrines of Orthodoxy was more explicit, decided, and fundamental than had been common among us. The first article in the volume, entitled "A Defence of Liberal Christianity," was written by myself. Mr. Buckminster expressed to me, on his own part, no dissatisfaction with its sentiments, but told me of a remark made on it by our common friend, Mr. Vaughan of Hallowell, the pupil and friend of Dr. Priestley, — that it reminded him of what the English Unitarians had been called, namely, "the Sect of the Imprudents." For one who should read it now with only a knowledge of the present state of religious opinion and feeling in our country, it might be difficult to discover why the writer should be thought to belong to the sect of the Imprudents. But, in 1809, Mr. Buckminster had said, in a letter to Mr. Belsham, (published in Williams's *Life of Belsham*,) "Do you wish to know anything of American Theology? I can only tell you, that, except in the small town of Boston and its vicinity, there cannot be collected, from a space of one hundred miles, six clergymen who have any conceptions of rational theology, and who would not shrink from the suspicion of antitrinitarianism in any shape."

But the publication of the *General Repository* soon failed for want of support. It was too bold for the proper prudence, or the worldly caution, or for the actual convictions, of a large portion of the liberal party. Mr. Channing, in a defence of those who were then among us beginning to be called Unitarians, in his "Letter to Mr. Thacher," published in 1815, said of it, "As to the *General Repository*, I never for a moment imagined that its editor was constituted or acknowledged as the organ of his brethren; and while its high literary merit has been allowed, I have heard some of its sentiments disapproved by a majority of those with whom I conversed." When, in 1819, I was elected Professor of Biblical Criticism, the President of the College, Dr. Kirkland, informed me that Mr. Channing, who was then a member of its Corporation, was willing to assign me the duties and the salary of the office, but objected to giving me the title of Professor on account of the injury it might be to the College to make so conspicuous its connection with one holding such opinions as mine.

Its decided character, however, was not the only obstacle to the success of the General Repository. It was overburdened with learning, or with what passed for learning among us, out of proportion to the amount of theological knowledge, or interest in such knowledge, which existed among its readers. I gave in it an account of the controversy between Dr. Priestley and Dr. Horsley, the fame of which had not then died out; and this was continued through several numbers. Dr. Kirkland, with his usual happiness in giving advice indirectly, told me that people said "I was writing what nobody but myself understood." Still an effort was made by its friends to promote its circulation. In 1813, a recommendation of it (unsolicited by me) was published as a circular, bearing the signatures of five of the most respectable laymen of Boston, — Samuel Eliot, Samuel Dexter, Dudley A. Tyng, Joseph Hall, and John Lowell. But it was not thought advisable that any clergyman should sign it.

The facts which I have stated, few as they are, may throw some light on the oppressive bigotry which prevailed among us during the life-time of Mr. Buckminster. I am tempted to add another proof. A passage comes to my recollection of a lecture which I delivered in the College Chapel, about the year 1816 (I cannot fix the precise date). I have looked it up in the manuscript, and find it to be to this effect: —

" 'Whatever an ill man believes,' says Jeremy Taylor, 'if he therefore believes it because it serves his own ends, be his belief true or false, the man hath an heretical mind; for to serve his own ends, his mind is prepared to believe a lie. But a good man, that believes what, according to his light and the use of his moral industry, he thinks true, whether he hits upon the right or no, because he hath a mind desirous of truth, and prepared to believe every truth, is therefore acceptable to God; because nothing hindered him from it but what he could not help, — his misery and his weakness, — which being imperfections merely natural, which God never punishes, he stands fair for a blessing of his morality, which God always accepts.' This is admirable. — But it is melancholy to think, that we have so long been accustomed to nothing but what is bigoted, and narrow, and irrational on the subject of religion, that we feel delight in the expression of any generous or manly sentiment, though it be nothing but the most obvious truth. We are like those who have been so long confined within the walls of a prison, that they

are filled with emotion at being restored to the common light and air."

When we consider that it would be an absurdity too gross to be imagined, for one among us at the present day to deliver in a lecture the concluding remarks on the passage of Taylor, we may comprehend what a vast change has taken place since they were written.

I was some time since as much vexed as there was any occasion for being, (which, to say the truth, was very little,) by a passage in a note by Mr. W. H. Channing to the Preface to his Memoir of his uncle, in which he says, that, in a sketch which he had written "of the rise and progress of the Unitarian controversy," but forbore to publish, "the rightful position was assigned to the General Repository, as the advance-guard of Unitarianism proper." What he meant by the words "Unitarianism proper" I do not understand; nor do I conceive him to have had any distinct meaning in his own mind. No work, in opposition to what its writer regarded as prevailing errors concerning religion, could have less connection than the Repository with anything that may be called "Unitarianism proper," unless by this term be meant simply Antitrinitarianism, — a sense which, as appears from the connection in which it stands, could not reasonably be intended. The common use of the words "Unitarians" and "Unitarianism," to denote a sect and the opinions of that sect, was, I think, introduced among those who had before been called "Liberal Christians," by Mr. Channing, through his Letter to Mr. Thacher, published in 1815. The Orthodox had endeavoured to fix that name on Liberal Christians invidiously, for the purpose of confounding them with the English Unitarians of that time, and of making them responsible for all the speculations of members of that body. Mr. Channing, though recognizing it as an ambiguous term, and remonstrating against the use made of it by the Orthodox, and carefully defining that by Unitarianism he meant only Antitrinitarianism, yet adopted the appellation as the distinctive name of those in whose defence he was writing. In a note to this Letter, he explains that he regarded the name, Liberal Christians, as too assuming; "because the word *liberality* expresses the noblest qualities of the human mind." That name, however, had been familiarly applied by the Orthodox to their opponents, without any intention either of complimenting them or of sneering at them.

The name Unitarian gradually became prevalent among

us, and those by whom it was assumed combined into a sect. They thus quitted the high ground on which they had stood, or might have stood, in company with the good and wise, the philosophers of different ages and different denominations, — with such men as Erasmus, and Grotius, and Locke, and Le Clerc, who, according to their light, opposed the religious errors prevailing round them, and were “the liberal Christians” of their day. They exchanged this for a connection with the English Unitarians as they then existed; and notwithstanding the credit conferred on that sect by the eminent talents and great virtues of Priestley and the sturdy honesty of Belsham, this connection was an unfortunate one. They were obliged continually to explain that they were not to be held responsible either for the metaphysical doctrines or for many of the religious sentiments of its more conspicuous members, — that they agreed with them only in being Antitrinitarians. There are times in which religious truth is exposed to particular persecution and obloquy, when it may be well for its defenders to combine into a sect for mutual encouragement and support. But the pressure from without must be great to render it advisable. The combination implied in the formation of a religious sect at the present day, with a distinctive name, is attended with great evils. It is, however, favored by many through their love of sympathy, and from the excitement of party feeling, or because, as members or zealots of a sect, they may attain to a consideration which, as standing alone, they could not possess. But religious truth, the great means of improving the condition of mankind, is not to be ascertained and made efficacious through the combination of men into religious parties, though its influence may be greatly impeded by such combinations.

The name of “Unitarians,” to whatever honor it had been raised by the persecuted “Polish Brotherhood,” the *Fratres Poloni*, in the seventeenth century, was an unfortunate name to be assumed in the beginning of the nineteenth, by a sect among us. It was explained as denoting merely a disbelief of the doctrine of the Trinity, and as including all (that is, as was then meant, all *Christians*) who rejected that doctrine, whatever might be their differences of opinion respecting the language of Scripture which has been supposed to relate to it. But were Christian sects at the present day to be founded at all, it must be bad to found them on disbelief, and especially, as in the present case, on the dis-



belief of a particular doctrine, — that of the Trinity. It is giving this doctrine a solitary place of preëminence among a multitude of other errors all linked together, and some of them equally, or even far more, disastrous. The ill consequences of a name of such indefinite comprehensiveness, and so easily abused, when this name is assumed by a religious party, were not at once perceived. But they have become conspicuous. When a Unitarian was first spoken of among us, a unitarian Christian, as I have said, was meant. But the adjunct “unitarian” has succeeded to a great extent in dispossessing the substantive “Christian” of its power; and the Christian Unitarians among us have found themselves brought into strange connection with such men as Fox and Martineau in England, with the pantheists Spinoza and Schleiermacher, and with the most noted of modern infidels, Strauss, — all of whom I have seen praised, and recommended as religious instructors, in what were professedly Unitarian publications. Some of the obscurer ramifications of the sect have even intertwined themselves with the Fourierites and Communists of France.

I have already got beyond the date of the period to which your inquiry related. But I am unwilling to conclude with the few sentences last written. What is now wanting to the progress and influence of rational religion among us is a revival of the feeling of the importance of religious truth, — a practical conviction of the fact, which, however obvious and indisputable, does not seem to be generally recognized, that it is only by religious truth that religious errors, with all their attendant evils, can be done away, and of a fact equally obvious, that, in the present conflict of opinions, minds disciplined in habits of correct reasoning and informed by extensive learning, minds acquainted with the different branches of theological science, which embraces or touches upon all the higher and more important subjects of thought, are required for the attainment and communication of religious truth. In one word, it is learned and able theologians who are wanted, — such men as Mr. Buckminster.

I wish I had more reason to hope that this letter may be of any service to you. Such as it is, it is wholly at your disposal.

Very truly yours,

ANDREWS NORTON.

*Cambridge, 17 May, 1849.*

## ART II. — HYMNS FOR THE SANCTUARY.\*

THIS work, prepared for the use of the West Boston Society, has evidently been compiled, not only with great care, but also by persons possessing eminent qualifications for the task. It exhibits throughout a laborious and discriminating fidelity in selection, a high appreciation of poetical and devotional merit, and, what is most essential, a high idea of the true nature of a hymn-book. In addition to these weightier matters, much pains have been taken to restore hymns to their original form ; and we consider it one of its excellencies, that it has retained those evangelical words and phrases, which some seem to regard as obsolete, but which in reality come down to us hallowed and made alive by the associations of centuries of Christian history and experience. We welcome its appearance, and none the less heartily that there have been so many works of a similar kind lately published.

It is a great, though common mistake, to suppose that our hymn-books are very much alike. The truth is, that, though they contain so much in common, they differ scarcely less than original works which treat of the same general subject. The different trees of the forest are composed of similar elements, but differently combined ; — the result in one case is an oak, and in another an elm. The same general features are in every human face, but so combined that no two men entirely resemble each other. So the materials of these works of devotion are to a large extent the same, but they differ finally, in the result, as much as the characters of their compilers. A man's peculiar taste is seen even more in what he selects than in what he writes. As a writer, he may fail altogether of expressing what is in his mind ; but what he selects represents his real tastes and tendencies.\* Thus, a good hymn-book, instead of being a work within the competency of any one who may incline to attempt its formation, requires not only literary taste and culture, but the religious character, experiences, and emotions which enable one to understand what are the true characteristics of a psalm to Almighty God.

We will not compare this work with those of a similar

---

\* *Hymns for the Sanctuary.* Boston : Wm. Crosby & H. P. Nichols. 111, Washington Street. 1849.

kind which have preceded it, further than to say, that, at the least, it must be placed in the same rank with the very best we have. Others have their peculiar merits, which would be estimated differently by different persons. Instead of entering into any comparisons, we will state what we consider to be the characteristic merit of this work.

Its distinguishing characteristic is, that it is specially suited to be used in the devotions of a Christian assembly. This might seem to be true of any book of hymns; but we use the words emphatically. The title of the work might have properly been, "*Hymns for the Christian Sanctuary.*" We think this a matter of such primary importance, that, notwithstanding the narrow limits allowed to us for it, we must explain what we mean.

There are poems by Byron and Moore on religious subjects; but the religion is subordinate to the poetry. You might possibly call them religious poems, but in few cases Christian hymns. Then there are large numbers of hymns which attempt to give expression to the religious sentiment, but which neither in tone nor in thought imply the recognition of any truths except what would commonly be classed as those of Natural Religion. They are religious, but there is nothing about them to mark them as Christian. They express nothing which would not be responded to by religious unbelievers. There is another class, just now popular, of those which do not so much embody the religious sentiment, as certain vague and generally languid sentimentalisms about religion. They are subjective and egotistical. They express none of the higher emotions, whose roots are in the moral and intellectual convictions, and which are blended inseparably with the will; but only transient moods—the mere shifting sunshine and shadow—of the mind. They often contain pleasant verses and graceful turns of thought; but, like all things egotistical, they have little permanent value as poems, and none at all as hymns.

There are others written in a higher mood. The best examples are to be found among those of Watts. The distinguishing peculiarity of Watts's hymns is not the poetry, nor the excellence of the lyrical form, remarkable as they are for both; it is far deeper and more vital. They are expressions, not merely of the religious sentiment, but of the religious sentiment colored, directed, inspired by the Christian faith. They imply an intense faith in the sovereignty and

providence of a personal God, in the inestimable importance of the mediation of Christ, and in those truths which make the Christian religion what it is. The religious sentiment is formed around this faith, — is embodied in and blended with it. They express not only the sublimest sentiments of devotion, but the devotion of one who looks up to God, and abroad on man, and into the human heart, from the Christian point of view, — of one who worships God through our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. The use of Watts's hymns in an assembly of pantheists or anti-supernaturalists would be absurd. They would be utterly out of place. There would not only be perpetual contradiction between the sentiments which they express and the minds of those who used them, but their characteristic and real merits would be unintelligible to persons whose religious feelings had become conformed to such different ways of thinking.

We do not speak of this as their sole excellence. As mere lyrical poems, they are among the finest in the language. We have heard his openings remarked upon as being, almost invariably, noble bursts of lyrical devotion. The criticism was as just as it was discriminating. Whatever may follow, the first lines of Watts's hymns are the fitting preludes of grand poems. They lift up the mind to the sublimest heights of thought and emotion. They are so superior in this respect to any thing else in our religious literature, that you might distinguish a hymn of Watts by the free, soaring, lyrical grandeur of the first line, almost as certainly as by seeing his name prefixed. In his best productions, what follows is worthy of the commencement. In grandeur and breadth and elevation of thought, they are as much above the great proportion of hymns, as the masses of Mozart or the symphonies of Beethoven are above the pleasant melodies which are the delight of every piano and hand-organ for a month, and then disappear for ever. And when, as he often does, he falls below this high level, he furnishes the standard by which we measure the depth of his fall.

There is another class of hymns of great merit, and not to be dispensed with, such as the Wesleyan and Moravian. But they do not rise to so high a level. They are the hymns of a meditative and mystical mind, which lingers among the clouds, and sees things, it may be, through a golden mist, but still through a mist. They are pervaded by a sentiment of almost passive, Oriental acquies-



cence. In Watts's hymns, there is the same spirit of submission, but it is the submission of a vigorous will, which, as with a fresh, heroic joy, chooses God as the infinite good ; and with this, not a spirit of mere quietism, but an active sense of moral obligation.

One other characteristic of Watts's hymns is, that the emotions expressed are the developments, the flowerings out, of intelligent and settled convictions. As we read the best among them, a beam of light shines through and over the lines. It is as when one looks up from the shadows below, into the top of a tall tree through which stream the rays of the descending sun ; you are in shadow, but on that high summit every twig is tinged with light, and every leaf waves in golden radiance. Or rather, his song soars up like the bird which rises to meet the morning, and whose wings catch the sunbeams, while all below is yet in darkness.

Of course, among the hundreds of hymns which Watts wrote, large numbers possess little value, and not a few are mournful failures. But those in which he was most successful, better than any others we have, give utterance to the highest Christian experiences. To such an extent is this the case, that we undertake to say, that, in any Christian congregation, during a time of religious apathy, his hymns will be little used, and this because of a secret sense of inappropriateness ; and that, as religious life is awakened, the strains of Watts will more and more frequently rise from the lips of the assembled worshippers. It is because they express the highest Christian experiences, that they maintain their place. Every year, multitudes of new ones are written, to attract for a time by their novelty, and then to perish with the autumn leaves ; while we turn back again to the imperishable hymns of Watts, which, though old in years and familiar in form, have the perennial freshness of truth and of all true emotion.

Our estimate of the volume which has suggested these remarks may be best understood by our saying, that, to a remarkable degree, in making the selection, the true idea of a hymn seems to have been steadily kept in view. The volume is not a chance aggregation of religious pieces without principle or end. It is not a selection of religious poetry in general, but a selection of hymns for Christian worship. The principle by which the compilers have evidently been governed is, we believe, the true one, and the only one

which will lead to the formation of a work of permanent value. In describing the characteristics of Watts's hymns, we have described what appears to us most characteristic about this volume. It has many minor merits, but this point is so essential, that, in comparison with it, other things seem unimportant. Probably some few of the hymns have been selected because of personal associations with them, rather than on account of their intrinsic value ; and most readers may miss individual pieces which are interesting to them because of similar associations. There are also several hymns which would generally be considered as ranking among the best, which, we are sorry to see, have not found a place in this book ; but, of those commonly known which are omitted, we think, on the whole, that the number is small which may not, without any serious regrets, be suffered to drop out of a collection of this kind. The work gives abundant evidence that there presided over it as vigilant a taste in what was rejected as in what has been adopted.

We have suffered our remarks to extend beyond the ordinary limits of a notice, for several reasons. The preparation of a hymn-book is no work of a day, nor for a mere literary artisan. It requires much labor and peculiar qualifications. It is very important, too, when a church adopts a new hymn-book, that it should be a good one. And in the multitude of new collections issuing from the press, it is desirable that the characteristic excellences of those which may be regarded as successful should be understood. We might have stopped, after expressing in general terms our high sense of the good judgment, the taste, and the success with which this work has been prepared ; but, for the reasons we have mentioned, we have thought it better to enter into a more particular account of its merits. We will only add, in conclusion, that any church, about to adopt a new hymn-book, will do well to give this a careful examination.

E. P.

---

## ART. III. — RESPONSIBILITY FOR OPINION.

[A Discourse, delivered before the Alumni of the Divinity School of the University at Cambridge, July 16, 1849. By REV. EDWARD B. HALL, D. D.]

IN the failure of those whom you invited to address you on this occasion, brethren, I have come at the request of your committee, who were naturally desirous of preventing, at least, a total failure. And as the Association of the Alumni did not themselves suggest, and could not anticipate, this choice of a speaker, the committee alone are responsible for the result.

Desiring to find a subject not inappropriate, yet not the same as that which the occasion has usually suggested, — a true or false theology, — I venture to speak of that which belongs alike to theology and to all departments of thought ; namely, Thought itself, as it takes the form of opinion, and grows into conviction, exerting the influence, and bearing the responsibility, of belief. Our Responsibility for Belief, or rather for Opinion, in the popular and freest use of the word, is a subject which almost every one must approach with a deeper sense of its importance than of his power to throw upon it any new light. To show how strangely its importance is forgotten or slighted by the mass of thinkers, yet how greatly exaggerated or misrepresented by preachers and sectarists of every name, — to present its practical and spiritual aspects, apart from its metaphysical questions, or as still remaining, in whatever way those questions are decided, — to indicate the direction in which freedom, duty, and responsibility lie, in connection with opinion, — and to quicken, if I may, our own sense of accountability, as believers in anything, but especially as teachers of sound doctrine, — is my present aim.

Looking, first, at the facts of the subject, we see, in one direction, the utmost license and recklessness as to opinion, — opinion as such, the mere process of forming a judgment, the act of believing, independently of the matter believed. Indeed, the common use of these terms for one another, — opinion and belief, — and the indiscriminate application of all similar terms, — faith, doctrine, sentiment, persuasion, — show us that men see no difference between a notion and a conviction, and are as ready to speak and act from one as from the other.

So, commonly, no difference is recognized between doubt and unbelief, skepticism and infidelity. Spending no time now upon precise definition, we speak of the process or act by which the mind reaches a conclusion or forms an opinion. And this process or act, we say, is thought by many, probably by most men, to be of very little consequence in itself. It is assumed, that opinion and belief are wholly involuntary, subject to no laws of our own making, to no influences which we can control, possessing no moral freedom, and therefore no moral character or responsibility. The whole process, if not the result, of believing, is taken to be the accident of birth, age, country, constitution, established religion, and prevailing custom, — as little a matter of choice and accountableness as a man's form or features. This is one extreme. In another direction, we see a close approach to the opposite extreme. Opinion is regarded and treated precisely the same as conduct. It is said to be a part of conduct, and by some seems to be considered the most important part. It has been lifted above conduct and character. No kind of character has been so magnified in importance as each kind of opinion by those who have held it. Soundness is deemed better than sincerity. Heresy is worse than immorality. The manner of living is not so sure a passport to favor here, or acceptance hereafter, as the manner of thinking. Not profound thinking; that has been seldom demanded, and least in religion. Not charitable thinking; no system or church has made this one of its conditions. Not free thinking; that is the most dreaded of all. But right thinking, according to the inquisitor's rule, and independently of everything else. Mere opinion, conformed to opinion. Less than this even; the mere declaration of conformity, with little questioning as to its sincerity or consistency, and often in circumstances which seem to contradict both. Still the declaration must be made, and will be accepted where nothing will be accepted in place of it, but eternal penalties annexed to a different declaration. Nor is it the least remarkable fact, in this connection, that those who insist most upon such a declaration, as obligatory and essential, hold views of the human mind and the Divine decree, which render doubtful, if not impossible, the power of compliance with such a demand. We speak of it intellectually now. Belief in predestination and election, in the original depravity of the will, and in the total inability of the agent, would seem to be at variance with



voluntary, instant, virtuous assent, or free and criminal dissent. Yet the one is required, and the other forbidden, at the most fearful peril, irrespective of the nation or land in which the individual was born, the religion in which he was trained, the mental and moral light or darkness by which he has been invested. Even John Foster, whose views of retribution force his own brethren into a perplexing concession, both as to freedom and piety, asserts, "that no man can become good, in the Christian sense, but by this operation from without, on the part of the sovereign agent, and independent of the will of man."

Again ; looking out upon the world of mind as it is, we see many, and never more than now, encouraging all possible freedom of opinion and expression, in all men, on all subjects ; and not only so, but making a virtue of this freedom. He is the best thinker, who thinks most freely ! He is the strongest in mind, and commonly the wisest, who decides with least hesitation, and pronounces with most confidence, on every question that arises. The coward he, or the imbecile, who doubts and waits ; the bigot, who would fix limit or law to free thought. And of these also, who thus talk, observe the inconsistency. They extol doubt, where most men believe. They think the better of the skeptic whose skepticism turns upon generally received truths. It is weak and puerile to wait, or want other light than that which the mind itself emits ; but still weaker and more puerile, to believe by a light from above, though agreeing with the mind's own light. Hasty and confident believers in anything, or nothing, are of higher intellect than deliberate, assured, humble believers in revelation ! Opposed to this class of reasoners, we find the great body of Christians, as far off as they can get, but not beyond inconsistency ; denouncing all doubt and unbelief as sinful and accountable, except the doubt and unbelief which agree with their own. For, against that which they believe, stands that which they disbelieve ; and this they reject as hastily as possible, with as little examination, knowledge, or thought of responsibility, as the wildest and hardest exhibit, in their belief and unbelief. In short, belief and unbelief, haste and caution, firmness and wavering, are judged by their company rather than their character. He who passes quickly from one entire system of faith to another wholly unlike it, worshipping this Sabbath in St. Paul's and the next in St. Peter's, is either a super-

ficial, skeptical, lost scorner, or a profound, illumined, sanctified believer, according as he goes in the one or in the other direction ; and no earthly discerner shall be able to say in which transition, or which resting-place, there was most of belief or unbelief. There may have been very little in either, and still less of the sense of responsibility.

Again ; we see the passive receiver and unreflecting retainer of opinions commended and thought secure, while the diligent inquirer and careful discriminator is condemned. Abstractly, all agree with the Apostle in urging the duty of "proving all things" ; but it is only on condition that the good which is "held fast" shall be of one kind. Investigation has always been looked upon with distrust and apprehension, on the side of the believer ; it is only in the unbeliever, or the dissenter, that it becomes a duty and a virtue ; and this, though the act of the mind is precisely the same, and, so far as we know, the intent of the heart the same, in both cases. This rashness of judgment, showing either gross ignorance, or entire disregard, of the nature of belief and charity alike, appears in every sect. We all commend those who think with us, even if it be evident that they scarcely think at all, but have merely consented to grow up in the old faith, blindly inferring that all is right. Let one of them begin to doubt, inquire, dissent, and this, which may be his first self-movement and real belief, disturbs us ; nay, changes our estimate of the man's intellect. Were it only dissent from others, even from the creed and worship of his childhood and life, and assent to our own, however suddenly, ignorantly, angrily, the change were made, we could bear it, and many would praise it. As it is, there is only weakness or wickedness !

And so it comes to pass, that, as all men are dissenters as well as believers, all are weak or criminal in regard to their belief. And the reverse must be equally true ; for if there be imbecility or sin in mere dissent, there must be intelligence and virtue in mere assent, and all discrimination and religion are confounded. One is amazed to find even such minds as Dr. Johnson's (though, it is true, his force of intellect spent itself less in religion, than in superstition and prejudice) arguing for the greater probability of sincere conversion in proportion to the amount of belief, rather than the amount of evidence. "A man," he says, "who is converted from Protestantism to Popery, may be sincere ; he

parts with nothing ; he is only superadding to what he already had. But a convert from Popery to Protestantism gives up so much of what he has held as sacred as anything he retains, there is so much *laceration of mind* in such a conversion, that it can hardly be sincere and lasting." A singular judgment this upon the sincerity and reality of the Reformation ! especially when we remember the fact, which will hardly be disputed, that, of all believers, Romanists are most easily satisfied with a nominal conformity, an external sign, or verbal recantation. It is sufficient proof of the inanity as well as the tyranny of an absolute rule of faith, that it is content, if it can bring a man to pretend to renounce a physical truth, and hear him swear that he does not believe the earth moves, when he knows it does move.

Such are some of the obvious facts, as to the common estimate of the nature and value of opinion. They indicate a confusion of thought, a mingling of truth and error, wisdom and folly, on a question which, in one view, takes precedence of every other ; namely, How far are we responsible for the views we entertain of any subject, and the influence which they exert upon ourselves or others ?

The general answer to this question, and a practical and important answer, as we conceive, is very easy. We are responsible for our views of truth, and our opinions on all subjects, just so far as we have anything to do with their formation, or the power of knowing and controlling their influence. And if any say that this is no answer until we know what the power is, we reply, you may say the same of all responsibility. The difficulty is not peculiar to opinion, if you make it a question of certain knowledge or precise degree. The whole inquiry is needlessly embarrassed by this unreasonable demand. You cannot determine the exact measure of responsibility for any individual mind or man, in any connection, not even in the case of those nearest you, or indeed in your own. The exact measure is known only to the Omniscient ; determined, as it must be, by countless influences beginning at birth or before birth, beginning no one knows where, and exerting a possible influence at any and every point of time and character. None can tell the precise degree of accountableness of the vicious man, the intemperate, the criminal, the open murderer, compared with others of similar character, or with those held innocent. This, in any view, is an immense consideration, one that

should check the haste and temper, the confidence of all human judgment, inspiring the deepest humility and the largest charity. But should it prevent all discrimination? Does it annihilate accountableness? If not in connection with conduct, neither in connection with opinion. No greater difficulty presses upon the one than upon the other; and to represent it as greater and peculiar here is an evasion rather than an argument. The question, fairly stated, is one of fact, not of degree. And where it touches the degree, it is again the same as every other question of obligation and duty. The degree is according to the power, — the power of knowledge and control, in the past or the present. Responsibility of every kind, for the use of all talent, is “according to every man’s ability.” This we know. Of this we are as sure as of anything in religion or moral character. It is the rule of Christ; it is the simple, equal, essential principle of human accountableness; and it is as applicable to thought and opinion, in their formation and character, their expression and influence, as to anything else.

The whole question pertains to the fact of ability. Has a man any power over his opinions? And it is something to admit that this is the whole question. It goes very far, unless we greatly mistake, toward answering itself, when thus stated. For there probably is not a man living, of any intelligence, who will assert that we have *no* power over our opinions. There is not a man, whose consciousness, experience, and observation do not assure him that he has some power of this kind. His trouble is, to know “how much” he has. We do believe that this question of degree, which we have just dismissed, is at the root of the whole perplexity. It is that men see plainly, more plainly, they think, in regard to opinion than conduct, the impossibility of knowing all the influences that have operated, and all the power of resistance, or the individual disposition; and therefore insist, very fairly, that we cannot determine the exact responsibility in any case, — and thence infer, very unfairly, that there is no responsibility at all. Now we hold them to the prior and greater question. Do you mean to say that there is no power at all? You will not pretend that you know that; — do you believe it? Do you not believe and know, that, in all common cases, if not in all considerable cases, the individual has some power, and his character some



influence, over his opinions, — their sources, their intelligence, their soundness and effect? If you do know this, or believe it, it is enough. It constitutes responsibility. And the very fact that you do not know the degree of that responsibility should make you the more anxious, not the less, to use your power well, for yourself and all.

The fact of responsibility for opinion, then, — which is all we want, with a deeper and more active sense of it, — we infer, first, from general admission, if we may not say universal consciousness and conviction. And, say what you will of other forms of the question, — confound, convince, or confute the inquirer and the disputant as you may, upon the metaphysical or theological points, — it proves nothing against the fact, and amounts to nothing, compared with the importance of the truth, which men know in their hearts, that they have done something, may do much, to affect that which affects everything, — opinion.

The power of opinion! From this, and the conscious sense of it, the growing conviction of its importance to religion and society, we draw another inference for responsibility. The power of opinion is becoming a matter of wearisome repetition. It is seen to be only another expression for the power of mind, a simple fact, but one that does not seem to have been always obvious, or always allowed. In some way, hardly definable, mind and opinion have been separated, and their importance has been differently viewed. Religionists have summoned men to answer for their opinions, at the very moment that they have forbidden them to use their minds. Apart from all question of power, they have prohibited the use of power, — thus admitting it. Man must believe, but he must not think. He must be convinced, but he must not reason. He must see and discard his error, but beware how he exercises that faculty of his nature which alone discerns error and truth. Or, he may use his mind upon everything except its conclusions! He may form his own opinions, save where they are most important. Opinions, it is owned, are vastly important. They are essential. They mould the man. They make the age. They shape the laws, constitute literature, lead philosophy, define morality, arm the Church, usurp the throne, and move the world. Nor this world only. Opinions are the arbiters of human destiny. The mind is the man; and the state of the mind determines the doom of the man. Thought is sovereign;

and He who made it so decrees, in its character, the condition of the immortal soul. This is said, in one form or another, with more or less accuracy, and for different ends, by almost all classes of religionists and theorists ; and every one feels, that, however inaccurately presented, it has its foundation in truth, and assumes an importance not easily overstated. But how is it to be reconciled, is the question, with the denial or doubt of the mind's liberty and responsibility ? Is this mighty power, of which you so speak, all motionless and helpless, like so much dead matter ? Is it subject to every law but its own ? Does it bend beneath every breath of circumstance, and yield passively to every straw that floats against it, though itself the mightiest force in the universe ? We have power and responsibility, all say, in the use of muscle and money ; have we none in the use of mind ? What is it that controls the use of muscle and money, if not mind ? What power of any kind belongs to man, as man, but the power of mind ?

And here, again, the common consent of mankind goes against every idea of necessity and irresponsibility. Every form of religion, every pretence of obligation and duty, supposes freedom and accountableness. So do all law, justice, prohibition, penalty. It is curious to see how universally the conversation and conduct, the intercourse, interests, expectations, and common sense of the world, take for granted, and think it absurd to question, or rather never think of questioning, that which the theorist tells us is philosophically impossible. It is also curious to see, that those who suppose the mind wholly self-governed in all ordinary action and opinion suppose it a prisoner, a tool, or a plaything, the moment it enters that province where its highest powers are demanded, the highest truths and motives presented, and its every sentiment and motion associated with merit or demerit, salvation or perdition. There is contradiction here. Mind is one. Thought is spirit. Opinion, belief, faith, are attributes of humanity in its connection with Divinity. And if they are not free and accountable, nothing is free, and nothing accountable.

From man's confession, we look for another argument and illustration to God's declaration. And, omitting the more obvious inferences fairly drawn from every commandment, appeal, warning, and punishment, we take a single fact in the history of God's providence ; namely, his dealings with

the chosen people. The prejudice of the Jew has passed into a proverb, and by many is quoted as a perpetual miracle. If prejudice ever carried with it its own apology, it would seem to be here. If prepossession, false interpretation, corrupt teaching, universal opinion, and supposed prediction, can fasten upon the mind and will of man a helpless and sinless bondage, it must be in this instance, in relation to the character and work of the expected Deliverer. He appeared, and never has there been, never could there be, anything more unlike, than he and his religion, to all that had been preconceived and supposed to be Divinely promised. What was the result? That which was to be expected, we say; and which, according to fixed laws, could not be otherwise. Did *God* so regard it? Did he hold that people guiltless, in their treatment of his Christ? Did Christ himself, even in his predictions of their conduct and his fate, intimate that there was anything involuntary and irresponsible in all this? He did say, "If I had not come and spoken unto them, they had not had sin; but now they have no cloak for their sin." And if their sin had no cloak, it will be hard to weave one out of any materials that preconception and error furnish, even with the aid of prophecy and predestination. Language cannot easily approach nearer to the expression of intellectual and moral inability, than does much that is applied to the Jews, in reference to their belief and its influence. Yet, be it noted, in most of this language, strong as it is in its assertion of the power of prejudice, there is a constant blending of the mind with the heart, and an almost defining of inability by indisposition. "For this people's heart is waxed gross, and their ears are dull of hearing, and their eyes they have closed, lest at any time they should see with their eyes, and hear with their ears, and should understand with their heart, and should be converted, and I should heal them." And then there is the comprehensive account of the whole, which Christ gives in the language also of prophecy, intimating a guilty motive in the Jews, and the absence of all excuse. "They hated me without a cause." Hatred is of the heart; and it has something to do with the mind, its vision, its opinion, and its responsibility.

When, indeed, in the light of all else that God has taught us by our nature and his word, we read the history of his ancient people from its beginning to this hour, with all the influences that acted upon their understanding, and all the

consequences visited upon their conduct, we are led to fear that we talk too lightly, and with little discrimination, of the innocence of error and the excuses of unbelief. There is such a thing as a *duty* of believing. The eye was made for light, and light is adapted to the eye. There is a wilful blindness. There is a spiritual darkness. And "if the light that is in thee be darkness, how great is that darkness!" Truth may be loved, or it may be hated; the effect cannot be the same, but the truth remains, and duty remains. Our responsibility for the portion of truth that we hold, and for the use of mind and life in testing truth, and removing error from our own and other minds, is very serious. In our intercourse with error and infidelity, we have something to do besides addressing the understanding. In one of Dr. Arnold's letters from Rugby, on this point, there is a union of charity and faithfulness which should be more common, for the sake of both. "You may say," he writes, "that the individual in question is a moral man, and you think not unwilling to be convinced of his errors; that is, he sees the moral truth of Christianity, but cannot be persuaded of it intellectually. I should say that such a state of mind is one of very painful trial, and should be treated as such; that it is a state of mental disease, which, like many others, is aggravated by talking about it; and that he is in great danger of losing his perception of moral truth, as well as of intellectual, — of wishing Christianity to be false, as well as of being unable to be convinced that it is true. There are thousands of Christians, who see the difficulties which he sees quite as clearly as he does, and who long as eagerly as he can for that time when they shall know, even as they are known. But then they see clearly the difficulties of unbelief, and know, that, even intellectually, they are far greater. And in the mean while, they are contented to live by faith, and find, that, in so doing, their course practically is one of clear light; the moral result of the experiment is so abundantly satisfactory, that they are sure that they have truth on their side."

In the next place, we remark, there is much in our very use of language on this subject, which ought to bring us either to change our form of speech, or to admit and feel its import, and the personal responsibility it implies. What do we mean by "candor" in forming and retaining opinions? What is meant by being "fair or unfair," in examining the



merits of a question, and deciding upon that which is offered as truth either by man or God? Leave the question of accountableness for previous prejudice; is it, or is it not, in the power of a man to deal fairly or unfairly with his mind, in its present state? Can he be just or unjust in regard to his very prejudices, earnest or careless to learn their sources and watch their influence, reasonable or unreasonable, as to his knowledge or ignorance, his habits of thought, his mode of inquiry, his use of opportunity and capacity? He would be thought a fool, who should deny all power of this kind, and all moral difference. Every one knows that it is as easy to be honest or dishonest, in the use of mind, as of anything else. And yet this admission, single and simple enough, decides the whole practical, the whole moral question. No matter how we dispose of other questions, if we admit this, we are responsible for opinion; and the responsibility is not a light one. We see, also, precisely where the responsibility lies, and how it is to be weighed. It concerns not the state of the mind necessarily, but the use of that state, and of the mind itself. It concerns not the kind of opinion now held, so much as the manner in which it has been formed or is retained. It concerns not the different conditions of heathenism, Judaism, or Christianity, nor yet the thousand fences within the Christian field; but the individual use of such mind, light, opportunity, and power, as may be enjoyed within either province, or offered from another. In a word, the responsibility pertains not to doctrine, but to disposition,—not even to belief or unbelief, so much as to mental and moral fidelity in regard to one's belief or unbelief.

Here, besides a common error and danger, we suppose a peculiar error and danger to attach to those systems and sects called orthodox, which may be used for illustration. They ascribe immense importance, as they should, to opinion itself, and connect with it a fearful responsibility. But they direct it all to the condition of the mind, instead of fixing it upon the use of the mind. They make doctrine vital; but it is the shape, sound, or name of the doctrine, not the manner in which it was reached or is retained. They look upon their own congregations or denomination, and, seeing that their opinions are unchanged and unchanging, they are content. They look upon another denomination, like our own, and, seeing the opinions different, they are anxious, perhaps angry. Now we maintain that they have no reason or right to

be content with their own state, or to be troubled by ours. We say it, of course, intellectually, of opinion as such ; not denying that it is to be viewed morally, — for that we would inculcate throughout, — but denying that the moral character, or the responsibility, consists in the *kind* of opinion, which may be wholly accidental. That orthodox congregation, as they themselves would perhaps admit, does not possess a particle of merit on account of its orthodoxy. Its orthodoxy may not have any intellectual or moral character. It may be all hereditary, involuntary, unconscious, and void of merit or demerit. Not a child there, or a man, may have ever looked into his belief intelligently, inquiringly, responsibly. He may not have cared or dared to ask a single question, as to the correctness of his opinion. It may be correct ; but that does not prove that he is sound or faithful, still less that he is pious and a Christian. He may be a pious Christian, and be saved ; but it will not be by his orthodoxy, unless that has something more than an accidental origin, an allowed continuance, or a doctrinal essence. Nor, be his doctrine what it may, is he free from responsibility in regard to it. He is bound to use the mind, and his own mind ; to use his reason, and to enlighten it ; to use all his powers and opportunities in reference to this very matter of opinion. It is a momentous matter, as he says ; — let him not forget or slight his own concern in it. The responsibility which he preaches, and which we admit and urge, may reach deeper and farther than he is aware. It begins with himself, and concerns him more than any other, believer or unbeliever. It bids him look well to the sources of his own belief, to his fidelity to his own mind, to his openness to light and conviction, to his candor and thoroughness in seeking and comparing evidence. He may believe either with President Edwards or with President Day, as to the freedom of the will. He may hold to that which seems a necessary truth, indeed, and little more, — that the mind and the man must yield to the preponderating evidence or influence. Let him ask whether the preponderating influence, in his own case, may not have been education, fashion, prejudice, fear, ignorance. Let him settle this question about evidence, if no other, — whether there are not two ways of dealing with it, a fair and an unfair, a right and wrong way. Let him say whether it be not possible for a man, and a minister, to remain in ignorance or contempt of all the laws of evidence, the grounds of difference, the history of opin-

ion, and its dependence upon a multitude of circumstances, habits, feelings, and interests. Then, when he has been faithful to his own mind and belief, let him be just to other minds, and to men of a different belief. The responsibility goes there also. If he judge and condemn my belief, he is responsible both for the motive and the manner of his judgment. What does he know about my belief? Nothing but the name. Nothing as to the motive which has led to its adoption or retention; nothing at all as to the intent of the heart or the fidelity of the mind, the possible candor, diligence, love of truth, dread of error, earnest study of God's word, and daily striving to do his will, which may have attended and guided the formation of my opinions. These may have been greater in my case than in his, and they may have been less. Each is responsible for his own, and also for his judgment and treatment of the other. If my brother judge me by my opinions merely, and condemn uncharitably, while I have been faithful to my light, though in error, I would rather die in my heresy than in his orthodoxy. And if he take the position, that none are faithful to their light who do not come to his conclusions, we may well let him alone. There is a strong assertion of Chillingworth, which to some may seem over-bold, but which expresses something better than boldness: "If men do their best endeavour to free themselves from all error, and yet fail of it through human frailty, so well am I persuaded of the goodness of God, that, if in me alone should meet a confluence of all such errors of all the Protestants in the world, I should not be so much afraid of them all, as I should be to ask pardon for them."

We see, in this connection, another danger and error as to responsibility for opinion. That responsibility is singularly viewed by those who attempt to influence opinion by questionable means. Means of every kind have been used; and the worst most. Should we judge of men's views of the power of the mind over itself by their attempts to persecute it into truth, we should infer that they think very highly of that power. Their idea of free-will seems to be proportioned to their horror of free-thinking. A man is to be punished for doing what he must do, and then compelled to do what he cannot do. The absurdity of persecution exceeds even its wickedness. Its greatest achievement is the making of cowards, hypocrites, and dolts. Which has done most harm to religion and mind, — error, or the punishment of error? The

world groans with the sin of dissent. It has more reason to tremble for the sin of denunciation and intimidation. And this sin has not ceased. It is not confined to an age or a sect. Whatever form or weapon it has dropped, if it use all it dares to use, it is as bad as ever. Its bearing upon our present subject is one of its worst aspects and influences. Responsibility for opinion is invaded and mocked by every appeal to fear or favor. It is trifled with by all arguments from antiquity and authority; by all undue consideration of names and numbers, popularity and patronage; by all governments, or places of power and emolument, that make subscription to a creed a condition of office; by all churches and seminaries that exact pledges of unchanging belief, and a periodical signing of fixed doctrines; by all associations offering to ordain, or refusing to ordain, for conformity or non-conformity; by all doctrine and discipline that impute guilt to mere opinion, or annex advantage to mere profession. When two prelates of the English Church, a few years ago, were arraigned for the crime of becoming subscribers to a "Socinian work," and were driven by public speeches, newspaper abuse, and ecclesiastical threats, into writing submissive letters to the higher powers,\* — when young men, who go out from New England, with a liberal faith, into distant States, are told and made to feel that their success in business, and their position in society, will depend upon their place of worship, — when Protestants who resisted domination, and Puritans who fled from persecution, and liberals who asserted absolute independence, use any power to overawe that independence, or impose upon it any law but personal responsibility to God, — they darken and degrade the whole idea of responsibility. All intimidation is perilous to truth. All intolerance offends alike against freedom of conscience and integrity of mind.

---

\* In 1838, the Bishops of Norwich and Durham subscribed for a work published by Mr. Turner, a Unitarian, and, according to them, "a man of unblemished character and great talent." Whereupon, the clergy of several dioceses sent up "requisitions to the Archbishop of Canterbury, to institute an episcopal commission to inquire into the conduct of the two bishops," who, at the same time, were called in the Tory papers "consecrated culprits," "obscene and flippant pamphleteers," "time-serving remonstrants," "rotten liberals," "hardened criminals," "Judases," "perfidious prelates," "surpliced traitors," "white-robed ministers of Satan," "pet-sons of the devil," etc.; until this shameful and ridiculous persecution had its designed effect, compelling the offenders to write submissively to explain and excuse their subscribing, on the ground that they did it out of politeness to Mr. Turner. — *LIEBER'S Political Ethics*, Vol. II. p. 196.



We have said nothing of the connection between *character* and opinion. It is too obvious to be dwelt upon, and too important to be omitted. The influence of opinion on life is not more sure than the influence of life on opinion. The former, indeed, is more apt to be qualified and uncertain than the latter. Opinions are often inert, or counteracted by other opinions. Life is action ; character is decision and influence. Error may be involuntary or inoperative ; vice cannot be. There are many good men under all forms of belief, though they might be better with better forms. There are many bad believers, whose propensities and iniquities would corrupt or neutralize the best faith. Truth may be held in "unrighteousness" ; and is not this unrighteousness even worse than when connected with ignorance and error ? Clearly, they who hold most truth, and claim to hold the best views either of piety or charity, are most responsible, both for the influence of these views on their lives, and the influence of their lives on the general belief or unbelief. None of us may be aware of the degree in which our character and daily conduct affect our faith, in its kind or its force. More books must be written, and wiser theories invented, before we shall be convinced that most men do not find it easy to believe that which they desire to believe, and hard to see reasons for that which reproves their habits and opposes present interest. Interest is a fearful element. There is no quality of mind, no pleading of truth, no weight of evidence, that it has not affected, and does not sometimes control. The first minds and the best men of the British nation found it difficult to perceive the iniquity of one of the most awful crimes that the world has known, that of the slave-trade, so long as it yielded thirty *per cent*. That infamous traffic, and the inhuman bondage it sustains, would never be defended from the Bible, as they now are by some sincere Christians and honest minds, could they be severed from the idea of profit and loss. We ascribe it not to motive, so much as to the nature of mind. There are other kinds of traffic in the midst of us, there are other common associations, there are lures of office, there are supposed interests of the nation, the party, and the employment, which suggest men's thoughts, which create their visions, which enlist their sympathies, affect their calculations, and work upon the passions, the judgment, the will, the belief, the whole mind and man ; and then, if other and lower influences come in to their aid,

— indulged appetites, debasing habits, foul companionship, lost character, and shameless effrontery, — who can measure, in youth or age, their effect upon the *power* of seeing and believing? Will a perverted or departed power release from obligation? Does drugging of the mind and deadening of conscience annul responsibility? Not so do your earthly tribunals decide. How far they will excuse at the bar of God, He alone will judge.

Of other views which the subject opens, we can refer to but one, — the responsibility of *publishing* opinions. This is distinct. By many it is thought most important, because most clear as to the principle. Writers who deny or greatly qualify our power, and therefore our accountableness, in forming opinions, admit both in regard to their publication, especially in the dissemination, of error. This, however, is assuming that a man knows that the views he disseminates are erroneous, and also that he has an independent will and absolute power in one case, and not in another. We take different ground. We decide nothing, and ask nothing, about the degree of the power, or the correctness of the opinions. If a man uses all the power he has, we will not trouble ourselves or him about anything more. But we protest against this perpetual escape from responsibility, through these endless side-questions. The truth is manifest. A man can speak, or he can be silent. He can think and listen with a desire to learn, or he can talk and teach without knowledge or sense. He can hold back his opinions, intuitions, or notions, long enough, at least, to define them; or he can throw them out, in the first moment of their birth, to do the little or great mischief that they may. There is a flippant haste not uncommon, a juvenile idea of independence, a great discovery that the world has been too long in darkness, and should be at once illumined. Worse than this, there is with many maturer minds, in regard to the expression of every supposed truth or the most daring doubt, a reckless defiance of consequences, which betokens anything rather than a profound or devout spirit. We would restrain no expression by law or public odium; still less would we make a virtue of tolerating either opinion or publication. We hope men are outgrowing so small a virtue as tolerance, whose very idea is an assumption. When we feel called to tolerate the action of a man's lungs in breathing, we may speak of tolerating the course of his thoughts in thinking. Still the freedom of

thought and of speech has its laws, and should observe them. They are not of human, but of Divine, enactment, having in view the health of the human mind and the welfare of society. A religious regard for the truth, a controlling sense of fallibility, a generous concern for the good of others rather than a jealous care of our own rights, should govern the expression and dissemination of opinions. There is a responsibility here which no good man will slight. If it can be measured at all, it must be by the magnitude of the theme of which we judge or speak, and the possible effect of a wrong and false utterance. Yes, the *possible* effect. The probable and the certain, every man, the merely prudent and politic, will consider. The Christian may be expected to think of the possible, and bring it into his estimate of duty and liberty. That opinion whose influence may be infinite is worthy of all solicitude. "There is a way that seemeth right unto a man, but the end thereof are the ways of death."

Brethren, it is a serious thing to believe and preach eternal verities. It is yet more serious, calling for more thought, knowledge, scrutiny of motive, and compass of mind, to doubt and reject that which comes to us as eternal verity, and by most minds is so held. But more solemn still is the work, and yet higher should be the qualifications of him who ventures to infuse doubts into other minds, to loosen the foundations of faith, to utter hasty thoughts on momentous themes, and scatter seeds which may germinate only the more quickly, because of the shallow earth on which they fall, — soon to die, or bear bitter fruit.

And have any men more reason than we, in this age and place, to consider the subject well in all its bearings? It is large, and it is near. It is spiritual and most practical. It pertains to our use or abuse of the highest powers, on the highest questions. It pertains to the thought, temper, character, of immortal minds. It tends either to Faith and Truth, the noblest attribute and the incomparable blessing of man, or to Unbelief and Error, his danger, weakness, delusion, often his sin and terrible suffering. In all, there is duty, marvellous power, glorious liberty, with solemn accountableness and infinite issues. Allow all that can be asked for ignorance, difference, or incapacity, enough remains for responsibility. Opinion is not essential to salvation, but it must affect, and may determine it. Belief is not everything, but it is much; and where it is the creature of character, to be in turn its inspirer

and director, its importance is incalculable. We say not, as one has lately and boldly said, "There is nothing that God hates so much as false doctrine." He hates sin infinitely more. But false doctrine may begin in sin, or may lead to it. All falsehood is baneful. Error may be involuntary, doubt is not guilt, knowledge is never perfect, ignorance and unbelief are not inherently sinful or necessarily fatal. God alone sees the hidden springs, the early influences, the besetting temptations, the actual conflicts of each mind and heart; and to him alone is known the positive guilt or the comparative innocence of the erring believer or the struggling doubter. All have not equal power of faith or sight; all have not the same accountableness. But all are accountable, — and they most, to whom most is given. How great our accountableness in the reception, the study, the teaching, and whole use of the truth, — the truth as it is in Jesus!

Strange is it, verily, — and thus may we sum up our simple conclusion, — if such truth be not important, or not capable of being surely known, clearly stated, and firmly held. Truth is fact; and opinion is the admission or rejection of fact. The truths of Jesus are the facts of God's existence, character, government, and will. Opinion in regard to these is that view of God which makes him to be to us something or nothing, spirit or matter, person or only space, a Father or dumb fate. On such vast and deep questions, there is a right and a wrong, fact and fable. And he who turns fact into fable, or mistakes fable for fact, or holds and dispenses either or both irrespectively, mistily, recklessly, does it at the peril of happiness, here and hereafter. If *man* does not permit ignorance of his laws to excuse the offender, neither does God. The sinner is a sufferer. And as truth saves, error exposes to sin and suffering. For the use of all our powers and means of discerning truth from error, and saving ourselves and others from sin and suffering, we are responsible. On all subjects important to us, definite opinions are attainable, if God be merciful. On all points, where truth is essential and falsehood fatal, truth can be found, if God is just. With man it rests, every man in every position, to use all powers of thought, investigation, prayer, affection, decision, as an accountable and immortal being. "As a man thinketh in his heart, so is he." "Whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap."



## ART. IV. — EVIL.

WE have no doubt that dualism, the doctrine of a good and an evil principle, rather than monotheism, a belief in one God, is the natural result of a philosophy unenlightened by revelation. It was hardly possible, that, when men began to reason upon abstract subjects, they should not have readily reached the belief in a benignant Deity, or that, from the harmony that pervades and unites all portions of the benevolent system, they should not have inferred the unity of the Divine Being. But with no efficient agent at work for the neutralization of physical or the conquest of moral evil, with misery and guilt pursuing their separate route and fulfilling their deadly offices unchecked, it is not surprising that many of the philosophical systems of antiquity should have maintained the existence of an antagonist principle of evil, holding concurrent and always conflicting jurisdiction with the supremely Good. We regard a semi-omnipotent devil as an almost unavoidable blot on the creed of natural religion. "The Son of God was manifested, that he might" not only "destroy the works," but obliterate the very idea, and render obsolete the name, "of the devil."

It is a crowning peculiarity of the Christian revelation, that in it God assumes the paternity of evil, recognizes it as an essential portion of his system, — as a minister of good, — as an angel appointed for the discipline of the heirs of salvation, who by conflict with it are to struggle into a higher birth, and to grow into the full prerogatives of a godlike nature. Christianity asserts for itself entire power over every kind and form of evil, and claims for the supremely Good absolute control over all its modes of existence and manifestation. It represents physical evil as the direct appointment of his love, — moral evil as existing only by his sufferance, destined to decline and disappear in his own foreordained time, through the counteracting agencies which he has established.

In attempting an approximate solution of the problem of evil; we would first remark that Christianity involves it in no new difficulties. The attempt is often made by skeptics to discredit Christianity, on the ground of the desolating calamities that afflict our race, the unequal allotment of happiness and of privileges among men, and the multitudes that are born and die without the knowledge of the right or the capacity

of moral goodness. These are all positive facts in the actual system of things. They exist in full force, independently of revelation. Christianity, so far from creating them, has been constantly rendering them less salient, inasmuch as it has removed some evils and mitigated others, increased the ranks of the privileged, and made large aggressions upon the domain of darkness and ignorance. These difficulties lie entirely within the province of natural religion; and whatever light the Gospel sheds upon them is wholly gratuitous, as it relates to questions which Christianity did not raise, and is not bound to solve.

We would make yet another preliminary observation. Even should we utterly fail of solving the problem of evil, we are not therefore to conclude that it does not admit of solution. It belongs to a system embracing all worlds and spanning twin eternities; while we can extend our regards but a little way into time and space, and can take into our view, at best, but insulated and fragmentary portions of the Divine administration. If in any direction we can dissipate the nearest clouds, and get a glimmering of twilight through the darkness, the probability is that the clouds and darkness appertain to our position, not to the God-ordained system of things, and that, when we reach a higher and more commanding point of view, they will cease to intercept our vision.

In attempting to reconcile the existence of evil with the Divine goodness, we should begin by considering that the goodness of God is susceptible of demonstration, independently of all question as to the origin or uses of evil. A watch implies purpose, contrivance, and skill on the part of its maker, though the same man may have made a hundred other things that are clumsy, misshapen, and useless. The unnumbered marks of design and adaptation, which we can discover in the human frame, are sufficient to establish the wisdom of its Creator, even were there in the complex mechanism many organs the functions of which we could not discern. Equally do arrangements for expressly benevolent purposes demonstrate a benevolent design, even though there be portions of the plan of Providence in which we can trace no such design. Now these benevolent arrangements pervade every department of nature. There are innumerable provisions, not only for existence, but for enjoyment. In the senses, the affections, and the intellect, man has many endowments, and performs many functions in no wise essential

to the preservation or the transmission of life, and having no possible use or office except the promotion of happiness. The external world is full of sights, sounds, and flavors, which can have had no end but animal or human enjoyment. Contrivances for this sole purpose crowd upon our observation, as we extend it to the lower races of animals, with reference to which, moral discipline and an ulterior condition of existence cannot be regarded as a part of the Divine plan. The myriads of organized beings, that float on the summer breeze, swarm in the waters, and make the forest glad, — the unnumbered forms of microscopic existence, that fill the chinks and crannies of creation with sentient and happy life, — demonstrate the benignity of the Creator. These are all fixed and incontrovertible facts ; and unless we are at liberty to resort to the theory of dualism, they establish a strong probability that evil itself belongs within the circle of the Divine benevolence.

This probability is greatly enhanced by the consideration, that in the progress of knowledge there are perpetually developed new traces of beneficent design in objects or events previously regarded with doubt or terror. In these six thousand years, human research has not unmasked a single seeming good in the system of external nature, and proved it an evil ; while it has been perpetually unmasking seeming evils, and transferring them to the catalogue of good. Is there not, then, ample reason to suppose that higher orders of beings look on those portions of the system, which still seem to us only evil, as parts of the economy of love ?

In approaching nearer the great problem, we shall find that physical evil, apart from moral, presents no peculiar difficulties. Most of the keenest sufferings, even of good men, are the direct result of guilt. Bodily pain and death are the only forms of seeming evil, which, independently of guilt, are necessarily attached to the condition of man. But bodily pain is entirely compatible with perfect inward serenity and joy, nay, may be highly conducive thereto by the consciousness of conquest and of spiritual power which it affords ; and in numerous instances it so enlarges and clarifies the soul's vision, and so exalts the moral nature, as to become a source of the purest happiness ever experienced, and an object of the loftiest gratitude. Death, too, is but translation from one to another mode of being, and " the sting of death is sin " ; — were it not for the sad associations which sin has grouped

around it, it would be regarded with cheerfulness and hope. But, beyond these inflictions, all other evils that are endured are of man's creation. Look at the superabundance of means provided by God for human well-being. The earth has ample resources to furnish sustenance, comfort, and luxury for all its dwellers, without excessive toil on the part of any. It is by superfluous and unused wealth, selfishly amassed and sordidly hoarded, that the masses are ground down in bondage, over-tasked, under-fed, and often deprived of almost every human attribute. It is selfishness, avarice, war, and oppression, that have created the intense degradation and misery under which the nations groan. As regards also the knowledge of fundamental and essential duty, there is abundant reason to believe, that, wherever it has been wanting, it has been lost by human depravity alone. Sacred history represents the races of men as having started from the same point of religious knowledge, — as having been originally possessed of the most momentous of all truths, God's infinity, unity, and his retributive justice. The traditions of all ancient nations confirm this account, inasmuch as they reach back farther than the birth of their gods, and bear unquestionable traces of a simple faith, connected in the earlier ages with an innocent and happy life, so that in all cases the light has been rejected, not withdrawn. Men therefore have been, and are, degraded and wretched, not because God has failed to provide ample means of virtue and happiness for all, but because his gifts have been neglected, abused, or spurned by those who might have preserved them for their own use and transmitted them to their posterity.

We are thus thrown back upon moral evil, as presenting the only serious difficulties involved in the whole subject now under discussion. What, then, is moral evil? It is identical with wrong; and wrong is the opposite of right. But what are right and wrong? Are they arbitrary or essential qualities? Has the distinction between them its origin in the will of God? or does it grow from the necessary conditions of all existence, whether human or Divine? We cannot but regard right and wrong as ultimate, absolute ideas, and the right as not God's appointment, but his law, — the necessity of his nature. Could we conceive of a Creator omnipotent and omniscient, yet destitute of all moral attributes, his decrees and acts would not be necessarily right. They would, indeed, be irresistible; but they might be wrong. God's



decrees and acts are not right because they are his ; but they are his because they are right. Right and wrong are inherent, essential characteristics of actions, unchangeable though the heavens fall. God can do no wrong, not because his omnipotence creates right, but because his wisdom and benevolence render him the impersonation of the right and the good. At every moment, right or wrong may be affirmed of every being and object in the universe. Every moral agent has his own peculiar nature, with its laws, adaptations, relations, and destiny. To keep those laws, to fulfil those adaptations, to discharge those relations, to approach that destiny, must of necessity be right, and the opposite of these things must be wrong. Unintelligent beings and objects are under the control of intelligent agents, human or Divine. They, too, have their laws, relations, and uses ; and according as these are kept or violated, they are the objects of right or wrong volitions. Now it is obvious that every thought, word, or deed of a conscious being must be either in accordance with, or in opposition to, the essential laws and relations of his own being, or of some other being or object, and therefore must be either right or wrong. And there is connected with the very idea of wrong that of loss, inconvenience, or suffering. The being who plays false with his own nature must derive something less than the highest happiness for which he was created, or must encounter some experience opposite to the happy condition designed for him ; and the object employed in contravention of its true uses must fail of rendering the enjoyment which it might have rendered, and is liable to give rise to sensations of an opposite character. Nor is this result affected by the ignorance of the wrong-doer. He who does right remains in harmony with the moral universe, and, by acting in accordance with the immutable laws and essential relations of his own nature and that of other beings, advances towards the fulfilment of his destiny. He who does wrong mars the harmony of the moral universe, and, in the precise proportion in which he violates the laws and relations of his own nature or of other beings, he forfeits his true place, and makes the attainment of his rightful destiny remote or doubtful. Wrong-doing is suicidal in its very nature, and Omnipotence itself can no more render it harmless than it can make two and two five. It must in all cases be attended by its appropriate retribution. The difference between the ignorant wrong-doer and him who is conscious of the wrong

that he does, (and it is a wide difference,) is, that the latter violates more and higher laws of his being, and therefore incurs a proportionally heavier penalty.

Now free agency must include the power of doing wrong, and therefore of incurring evil. Our next question, then, is, whether the ends of infinite benevolence might not have been answered without the creation of any being endowed with this perilous gift of free agency. Benevolence in the Creator and happiness in the creature are correlative and reciprocal terms. We must suppose that the plan of a perfectly benevolent Creator would embrace the production of every degree and kind of happiness of which finite beings are capable. Now does not every man's consciousness tell him that free agency is essential to the higher forms of happiness, nay, the source of immeasurably loftier enjoyment than can flow from all other sources combined? With what shall we compare it? With intelligence? Among animals, intelligence seems not to increase enjoyment. The insect, whose eye is a multiplying glass, and conveys to him images always gorgeously beautiful, but never true, — the kitten and the lamb, ignorant alike of the world's resources and its wiles, — evidently take a larger share of enjoyment than older and wiser animals. Intelligence brings with it labor, care, and fear, and of itself bestows no counterbalancing joy. This is equally the case among men, where the intellectual nature is developed independently of the moral. What are called the pleasures of knowledge, or of intellect, derive their zest from the moral character. Emotions and affections, which have their source in a loyal and obedient will, perform for the materials of knowledge the office which the gastric juice does for food, — enable us to digest and assimilate them, make them conducive to our nutriment and growth, to our elasticity and gladness of spirit. Without this moral solvent, we may have all knowledge and understand all mysteries, and yet they will be but burdensome and oppressive crudities, ministering to our isolation, misanthropy, and unrest. The omniscient devil of the popular theology, did he exist, would be only the more wretched for his omniscience. Now God might have created our race intelligent, yet incapable of wrong. But what possible enjoyment could have been within the reach of such a race, that would bear comparison with the consciousness of right choice and right action, against the entire power and strong temptation to do

wrong? Is there not more happiness in the soul of a single sufferer for righteousness' sake than we can imagine in a hundred well-doing automatons? And if so, it was the part of Divine mercy to provide for this higher form of happiness, even though it was distinctly foreseen that multitudes would spurn the noble gift.

But might there not have been full scope for free agency, and for the free choice of virtue, in a world less full of temptation, — in a world where there should have been sufficient knowledge of evil to make the choice of good intelligent and voluntary, yet not enough of the presence and power of evil to render the choice of it in many cases, or in any case, probable? Such a world we suppose heaven to be. We do not expect there to lose our power of choice, and yet we expect to choose there only the things that are excellent and divine. Why might not our world have been created on the same plan, and all men have grown into voluntary virtue without the fearful ordeal of sin, as we believe is the case with those who die in infancy? It ill becomes us to answer this question dogmatically. But may it not be essential to the full, free exercise of the power of moral choice, — to the clear knowledge of good and evil, — that, somewhere in the universe, or at some period of its history, sin shall have shown its nature experimentally, exhibited its atrocity by its fearful consequences, and, by the contrast thus created, shed needed lustre on the divine beauty of holiness? May not we in the future life, may not the translated infant, may not the unfallen first-born of heaven, may not those who shall live in this world in the better times foreshown in prophecy, attain a loftier elevation of moral freedom and power from the clear perception of moral distinctions to be drawn from the chequered experience of virtue and sin, through which our own and perhaps other races of intelligent beings are now passing? May not a history such as our race has thus far written for itself be necessary as the sunken foundation of the spiritual edifice, which in the latter days will stand firm on the solid earth, and send up its pinnacles to the heaven of heavens? May there not thus be a profound depth of spiritual significance in those words of the Psalmist, "He layeth the beams of his chambers upon the waters"?

This view certainly derives much confirmation from our own observation, and from the current experience of humanity. If moral excellence be the supreme good, there is no

more merciful appointment of Providence than the outward deformity, the wide-spread and promiscuous wretchedness, that result from human guilt. Nothing is so surely adapted to awaken repentance, and to produce reformation, as the handwriting of sin in the tears and blood of the innocent. Men see their own fiendish passions reflected back from the red and turbid waves of war, tumult, and oppression, and hear their echoes in the groans and cries of misery and despair ; and they are thus led to abhor their past selves, and to cherish purer affections and holier sentiments. Did not inward guilt produce these appalling forms of outward desolation and woe, there would be much less hope than there is of the establishment of the reign of God upon the earth. With immeasurably greater power than could have been wielded by the combined voices and pens of Christendom, there went forth of late through our country, from the devastated plains and violated homes of Mexico, the irreversible sentence of reprobation against the sordid ambition, the dereliction of principle, the brutality of soul, that lighted the flames of war, and so long refused to quench them. As philanthropists, we have full as little desire as expectation, that the outward results of these passions should be diminished in atrocity, till the passions themselves subside.

Similar are the uses of those portions of the course of nature which are terrific and disastrous in their operation, — flood and earthquake, volcano and tempest. The world in which we live, rich and beautiful as it is in its provisions for the happiness of sentient beings, is better adapted for a race of sinners than of saints ; and though we are assured that “ the saints shall inherit the earth,” we doubt not that they will have the old mansion thoroughly repaired before they take possession of it. These darker portions of the economy of nature are suited to impress that salutary fear which with the wicked is the beginning of wisdom, to awaken thoughtfulness in those who would otherwise be reckless, and to plant thick-set horrors in the way of transgressors. The representation of man prior to sin as in an earthly paradise, and of man in his redeemed estate as beyond the power of physical evil, accords with our sense of fitness. We find no difficulty in believing that God “ cursed the ground for man’s sake,” that is, for man’s good ; and that it is in sympathy with human guilt, “ that the whole creation groaneth and travaileth in pain together, . . . . waiting for the adoption, to wit,



the redemption, of our body," of the great body of humanity, to put on its robes of praise. We can therefore receive as literal the predictions of a renovation of outward nature to correspond with the entire regeneration of our race through the Gospel.

We would now speak of the case the most difficult of all to be reconciled with God's infinite benevolence, namely, the vast amount of evil done and incurred in utter ignorance of the right. Why the enlightened moral agent should be left free, and then suffered to eat of the fruit of his own doings, it is comparatively easy for us to say. But that myriads should live and die with no means for the education of conscience, and yet should be amenable to all the bitter consequences of sin, is indeed the darkest portion of God's ways. It was this which confounded St. Paul in the Epistle to the Romans, — the inequality of privilege apart from all considerations of moral merit ; and after a few hints illustrative of the essential obscurity of the subject, he closes by expressing his full conviction that the ultimate end of these appointments is, " that God might have mercy upon all," and then, turning away from the Book, of which he cannot unloose the seals, he exclaims, " O the depth of the riches both of the wisdom and knowledge of God ! how unsearchable are his judgments, and his ways past finding out ! For who hath known the mind of the Lord ? or who hath been his counsellor ? " There is no room here for the old scholastic notion of the Divine sovereignty, *alias* caprice or waywardness, which does what it pleases, and by might creates right even in acts opposed to our natural sense of right. These darker portions of the Divine administration are pervaded by the same immutable rectitude which we can trace in so many of its workings ; and to follow out its laws, to evolve in the moral history of all worlds and ages this ground principle of right in God's government, will no doubt be one of the high prerogatives of our spiritual being.

But, with reference to this case of the unprivileged and benighted, we may, perhaps, offer a few suggestions not unworthy of regard. Let it be considered, in the first place, how much of the noblest virtue is called into exercise by the abounding degradation and depravity of our race. The highest forms of excellence are those which have been developed in active antagonism with ignorance and moral evil. Error and sin have woven the confessor's wreath and the martyr's

crown ; and the inequalities of privilege among mankind, by bringing into such noble exercise every form and sentiment of virtue and philanthropy, have undoubtedly made the aggregate of human goodness and happiness greater than they could have been, had Adam and all his posterity stood on the platform of equal endowments and opportunities.

Yet let it not be imagined that we look on the many as hopeless victims for the good of the few, — that in our apprehension God abandons thousands to destruction, that he may create a Howard, a Cheverus, or a Father Mathew. On the other hand, we believe that no soul will fail of the means of salvation. Those who have passed through life in darkness and depression will doubtless find in the spiritual state the opportunity of a right choice, which was not vouchsafed them here ; and their very sufferings, without hope or remedy on earth, may prepare them to receive the light of heaven, when it dawns upon them, with the more implicit confidence and the warmer gratitude, even as in our Saviour's day the publicans and the outcast sinners of Judea pressed into the ranks of his followers, while the Scribes and Pharisees stood aloof. And with regard to those who are down-trodden and benighted here, yet welcome the revelation of truth and love in heaven, “ the sufferings of this present time are not worthy to be compared with the glory which shall be revealed ” ; and may not these very sufferings, in a multitude of instances, create a submissiveness and docility of spirit, — a hatred, from bitter experience, of the forms of evil in contact with which they have lived, — a readiness to embrace the true and good when offered, — in fine, those traits of character through which they may be enabled, in our Saviour's language, “ to receive the kingdom of heaven as a little child ” ?

Again, may not the appalling inequality of privilege, which we behold in the allotments of Providence, tend to make the heavenly society more perfect, by reproducing itself in a rich diversity of combinations of virtues and styles of character. We cannot conceive of souls in heaven as all manifesting the same proportions of goodness, — made *ad unguem* after the same pattern. There will, no doubt, be there, as here, wide diversities of gifts, manifestations, and offices. There will be the bold, energetic, lofty, commanding spirits, — leaders in the sacramental host ; and their ranks, we may imagine, will be chiefly filled by those who on earth encountered arduous labors and sacrifices for the redemption of their brethren,

— by philanthropists, missionaries, martyrs, apostles. Then there will be those in whom the reflective and active powers are more evenly blended ; and such souls will be ripened for heaven from among the many who, in an ordinary sphere of discipline, amidst balanced good and evil, embrace the good, eschew the evil, and lead sober, peaceful, godly lives. Then there will be in heaven those in whom the milder, gentler forms of spiritual excellence predominate, and to whom will be confided the most tender, loving ministries of Divine mercy ; and may not their numbers be continually reinforced by those called from earth in infancy, — whose innocence ripens into virtue without a conflict, — who wear the crown without having borne the cross ? In connection with these that have been enumerated, we can conceive of yet another type of character, which may be essential to the completeness of the orders of the heavenly society ; — a type which shall be furnished by the unprivileged, the despised, the rejected of this world. May they not be distinguished in heaven by the prompt and earnest receptivity of truth, — by the predominance of the confiding, trustful elements of character, — by the closeness with which, step by step, they “ follow the Lamb whithersoever he goeth ” ?

These are but imperfect hints towards the solution of the origin and reign of evil. We have reserved for our closing paragraph the consideration from which we find the greatest relief under perplexities of this class. It is the simple fact, that God has made an express and miraculous revelation to our race. Had the course of nature never been interrupted, we should apprehend that evil would reign for ever, for ever cast its deep shadow upon the earth, and cry to heaven in vain for relief and remedy. But, believing that the powers of nature have been shaken and its order arrested by a messenger of virtue, peace, and love from the spiritual world, we receive in faith his message, and see in him a power adequate to subdue all things to himself. We learn from him that evil will not reign always. We see evidence, than which we can conceive of none clearer, that he is ordained to bruise the serpent’s head. At his word, we see Satan fall like lightning from the heavens, and vanish from the earth. We hear from him the assurance that the tabernacle of God will yet be with men ; that he will wipe all tears from their eyes, and there shall be no sin, suffering, or sorrow. Above all, we learn from him, that we, who bear his name, are sacredly

bound to associate ourselves with him in the conflict with prevailing evil, and thus in frittering away the problem which we may not fully solve. Nor is there any way in which we can so surely relieve our doubts, think hopefully of our race, and feel that evil will lose its reign and have its end, as by doing our part, with heart and soul, with mind and strength, towards finishing the transgression, and bringing in everlasting righteousness.

A. P. P.

---

ART. V. — REPLIES TO DR. BUSHNELL.\*

THE attention which we have already bestowed upon Dr. Bushnell's recent work, "God in Christ," has naturally interested us in the numerous criticisms upon it by Trinitarian writers. Upon some of these we now propose to remark.

Dr. Pond's Review we should characterize, in general terms, as narrow, superficial, and, in some instances, offensively personal. It is an appeal, not to reason or to Scripture, but to the prejudices of the Orthodox denomination. It has some good points, but shows no enlargement of thought. There is a sort of logical dexterity, but, in a few instances at least, it would not be difficult to turn it against the author himself. Dr. Pond delights in making Dr. Bushnell contradict himself. The following is an example, on pp. 94, 95, of a "self-contradiction."

"So when our author [Dr. B.] had set forth, at length, the bad influence of dogma, or theology, ascribing to it no small part of the evils which have afflicted the Church, he goes on to say, that it is no part of his plan 'wholly to discard opinion, science, systematic theology, or even dogma.' These things 'have an immense pedagogic value.' They exert a 'very important

---

\* 1. *Review of Dr. Bushnell's "God in Christ."* By ENOCH POND, D. D., Professor in the Theological Seminary, Bangor, Maine. Bangor: E. F. Duren. 1849. 12mo. pp. 118.

2. *The Christian Observatory and Religious and Literary Magazine.* Editors: N. ADAMS, D. D., J. A. ALBRO, D. D., E. BEECHER, D. D., E. N. KIRK, A. W. M'CLURE, W. A. STEARNS, A. C. THOMPSON. Boston: J. V. Beane & Co. June, 1849. pp. 60.

3. *What does Dr. Bushnell mean?* From the New York Evangelist. Hartford: Case, Tiffany, & Co. 1849. pp. 28.

4. *Review of Dr. Bushnell's Theories of the Incarnation and the Atonement.* By ROBERT TURNBULL, Pastor of the First Baptist Church, Hartford, Conn. Hartford: Brockett, Fuller, & Co. 1849. pp. 77.



influence' in 'the catechetic discipline of children,' etc. — pp. 309–311."

To say nothing of the mutilations to which the closing extracts here have been subjected, we would only remark that Dr. Bushnell does not "go on to say that it is *no part* of his plan," etc. His words are, "It is not my design, as you perceive, *wholly* to discard opinion," etc. Is there any contradiction between this and what Dr. Pond has ascribed to him? May not Dr. Bushnell "set forth, at length, the bad influence of dogma," etc., without its being "his design *wholly* to discard it"?

We give one other instance of Professor Pond's logical acumen, from p. 96 :—

"On one page, Dr. B. speaks thus of the person of the Saviour : 'The Divine is so far uppermost in him, as to *suspend the proper manhood of his person*. He does not any longer *act the man*; particularly speaking, the man *sleeps* in him. It is as if *the man were not there*.' But on the very next page, we have what seems to us a palpable contradiction. 'As to the unreal, super-human human, that is, the human *acted wholly by the Divine* so as to have no action of its own, save in pretence,—what is it to us, but a mockery? What can we learn from it?' — pp. 126, 127."

Will the reader believe, what is nevertheless true, that this "palpable contradiction" "on the very next page," is a statement, not of what Dr. Bushnell himself believes, but of a view wholly different from his own, which he brings forward only to condemn? In the one case he speaks of the human as quiescent, while the divine alone acts in Christ; in the other, of the human acting by the influence of the divine upon it. They are wholly independent views, and cannot, in the sense that Dr. Pond asserts, contradict each other.

So much for the logic of the "Review." We have now a graver charge to bring against it. On page 104 is the following note :—

"It is well known that Dr. B. is a prominent candidate for the Hollis Professorship of Divinity at Cambridge College. From the above remarks, addressed to a company of divinity students, it may be gathered how he will proceed with *his* students, should he be so fortunate as to get the appointment. Of course, he will not teach them 'that dead body of abstractions, or logical prop-

ositions, called *theology*, but will exercise them after the manner of the old schools of the prophets. He will 'shut up the libraries'; 'shave their crowns'; 'put on hair girdles'; lead them 'into retirement'; 'practise them in songs, processions, and impassioned acts of devotion'; 'exercising them in symbols, and the senses of mystic forms'; and, standing up before them, a 'prophet father,' will kindle them by his own lofty 'improvisings.'"

Personalities like this, in a grave theological treatise, can, with intelligent men, accustomed to the courtesies due from one to another in the intercourse of Christian teachers, have no bad influence except on those who use them. We shall apply no epithets, except to say that it is a bad specimen of a sort of theological warfare which we hoped had become extinct, except in one or two religious periodicals which serve as vents to let off the foul air from the denomination with which they are connected. Dr. Pond has furnished a specimen; the June number of the *Christian Observatory* is the thing itself. We do not like to speak of the article in this as we think. We do not understand how the pure Christian men,—for such we know some of them to be,—whose names stand on the title-page of the work, could unite in the publication of such an article, unless the sense of individual responsibility is lost in numbers. It shows a great deal more ability than Dr. Pond's book,—but it is too much the ability to excite the disgust of those who reject, and the bad passions of those who accept it. It is equally remarkable for its sanctimoniousness and its levity.

"Were we to indulge," it says, "in a satirical vein, in speaking of the work, we might compare it to a book of pictures, by a rope-dancer, containing the following preface: Ground and Lofty Tumbling; to which is prefixed an admonition to the reader, that he cannot be sure, at any moment, whether the author is down or up; followed by a protest against being laughed at, with sour faces made up at those who shall dare to laugh; the whole concluded with an argument on the folly of ever attempting to make men keep step." — p. 246.

The very next sentence, after this, is a complaint against Dr. Bushnell for something "which will strike every observing and *pious* mind."

"We refer to the way in which he deals with things associated in the mind of a Christian with profoundest awe and deepest

religious experience. He reminds us of the French police officer, Pétion, who brought back the fugitive Louis and the royal ladies, in a carriage, to Paris. He ate an orange in the carriage, in the presence of the ladies, with a certain brusque familiarity, and tossed the peel out of the window, very near the king's face."

This, we take it for granted, is put in by way of copy, to show how the most sacred subjects ought to be treated by pious minds. Perhaps Dr. Bushnell will remember it when he writes again, and furnish us with a genuine specimen of wit chastened and sanctified.

We thank the Reviewers for one sentence:—"The point at issue between them [the Unitarians] and us is, whether the things which are revealed in the Bible, and which may be ascertained by a fair interpretation of its language, are to be believed on the authority of God, or are to be believed or rejected according to their agreement or disagreement with our independent reasoning."—p. 289. Now this is an honest statement, and we are glad to find Orthodox divines bold enough to bring it out openly. The Unitarians receive the Bible as their only rule of faith and practice; and "the things which are revealed in it, and which may be ascertained by a fair interpretation of its language," we hold, "are to be believed on the authority of God," as a revelation from him. But our Orthodox brethren have a creed of human device, and allowing the Bible to teach them only such things as may harmonize with their human creed; so that what we receive on the authority of a Divine revelation they must in fact "believe or reject according to its agreement or disagreement" with the results of human reasoning. This is the true issue between them and us, and on this issue we are at all times ready to meet them. This, as they rightly assert, and not the doctrine of the Trinity or the Atonement, is what really separates us from them; and if this is the meaning of the passage quoted above, we thank the writers for their frankness.

Notwithstanding what we have said, there are passages in the article before us which show uncommon ability in the treatment of theological subjects, and which, if confined to the discussion, on theological grounds, of the great subjects in hand, might do much to establish them on their true basis. We should rejoice to see such a discussion.

We have no room to speak of the remaining reviews, ex-  
VOL. XLVII. — 4TH S. VOL. XII. NO. II. 21

cept to say, that, while in their spirit they contrast favorably with the two which we have noticed, the third, understood to be by Professor Goodrich, is clear and pointed in style without any attempt at being comprehensive or profound, and the fourth, more ambitious in its design, displays a good deal of theological dexterity and ability, but is not a thorough review.

We hope in time to find, what the Orthodox body owe to the community, a calm, fair, comprehensive, and thorough review of Dr. Bushnell's remarkable book, — a book of many faults, but of very uncommon excellences. It is not a refutation of his doctrines to call him by hard names, or to prove some of his views to be pantheistic or Unitarian. Is not the great idea of pantheism, the universal and perpetual presence of God in all nature, so that of him and through him and to him are all things, the foundation on which every just notion of God must rest? It is only when we stop here, and deny that God, while he fills out all nature as a Divine law and presence, is also a personal being, who wills and knows and loves, that we conflict with the Christian idea of God. Professor Goodrich may prove that certain expressions used by Dr. Bushnell are pantheistic. But what then? Does not Dr. Bushnell go beyond these expressions, and from this pantheistic substratum, if we may so call it, of the Divine nature, reveal to us a personal God? Is it not the great aim of his *Discourse on the Trinity*, to show to us a Divine Being, who may address himself to our human intelligence and affections, as one who knows our weaknesses, who has compassion upon us, and would save us? Must not the intelligent reader consider these two views in their relation to each other? Is it just to take one by itself and represent that as the author's idea of God? In a subject of vast extent and complexity, it is often necessary to separate the parts, and present singly to the mind qualities which exist only in a sublime union and harmony one with another. In speaking of God, we may go behind all his acts of creation, and regard him as pure, absolute being, infinite and eternal, sufficient to himself, alone, and at rest in his own boundless perfections. Then we may regard him as a Creator, unfolding, from the depths of his own nature, worlds and systems of worlds, and countless multitudes of intelligent beings. Again, we may regard him as an infinite law, reaching through these worlds, binding them in perpetual harmony, and sus-



taining through them endless diversities of life, — leaf, star, insect, man, and angel. And yet again, we may think of him as manifesting himself in Jesus for the redemption of a fallen race. We *think* of these different operations of the Divine nature at different moments, and therefore seem to separate them from each other ; but in fact they may all be going on at one and the same moment, and all be requisite to fill up, even imperfectly, our highest human idea of the Divine nature. But it is not fair to take one of these sentences, to follow it out into its extreme logical bearings, without the qualifications which come from all the rest, and then represent it as our view of God. Yet this is what Dr. Bushnell's reviewers have done to convict him of pantheism.

So also in the charge of Unitarianism which is brought against him. In the first place, it has been thought, that, if that odious word could be fixed upon him, he must necessarily stand condemned by the Christian world. But who is not a Unitarian ? Who, calling himself a Christian, and receiving the Scriptures as his rule of faith, can for a moment, in the face of their most solemn declarations, dare to call in question the unity of God ? Suppose, then, that they do prove one of their writers to be a Unitarian ? Is he therefore, even on their own principles, a heretic ? Do not they also claim to be Unitarians ? Do they not reject with indignation and scorn every attempt that is made to convict them of worshipping three Gods ? If he, in certain parts of his writings, dwells more on the unity than the trinity of the Divine nature, is not the same true of St. Augustine, and Calvin, and Jonathan Edwards, and Dr. Emmons ?

But then Dr. Bushnell has endeavoured to reconcile the doctrine of the Unity with the doctrine of the Trinity, and in so doing has destroyed the old-fashioned Calvinistic doctrine of the Trinity. What follows ? That his doctrine is necessarily false ? So these reviewers, addressing themselves to the prejudices of a portion of the community, assert. But are they not bound to prove it ? Are they not bound to show where his arguments fail ? Assuming, as they all do, the unity of God as a basis, are they not bound to present some Trinitarian hypothesis which is not inconsistent with that fundamental doctrine in which all Christian sects agree ? Or, if they cannot do that, they certainly are bound to show that *their* view of the Trinity is clearly re-

vealed in the Scriptures, but that it involves a mystery beyond our human comprehension, and therefore is not to be explained. Yet if it is a mystery not to be explained, how do they know what it is? How do they know that Dr. Bushnell, or that we even, do not hold to it? If it is not a mystery, but may be explained, then they are bound to explain it, and show how it may be reconciled with the strict unity of the Divine nature. This is what Dr. Bushnell has attempted to do, and in the attempt has destroyed the tri-personality of God. They cry out against him for this; but let them, if they can, show us a better way, and either remove the apparent contradiction, or acknowledge that this whole doctrine of the Trinity is a mystery which they cannot understand. If they cannot understand it, we repeat the question, How do they know what they believe, or that they in fact believe more than we do? We cannot fathom the depths of the Divine nature. We cannot explain the exact method, or circumscribe the extent, of the manifestation of God in Jesus Christ. We do not profess to know all that is meant by the promise which our Saviour has given of the Paraclete, the Comforter, or all that is implied in the promise, "If a man love me, he will keep my words: and my Father will love him, and we will come unto him and make our abode with him." This manifestation of God in his Son, these promises of the Comforter, and of Christ himself and the Father, that they will come to us and make their abode with us, if we love Jesus and keep his words, are promises which we hold inexpressibly dear. But the length, and breadth, and depth, and height of their meaning we cannot comprehend. Why, then, on their own ground, may it not be, that, under these and other Scriptural expressions, we believe in all that is important to our spiritual well-being, as much as they who hold the doctrines of the Trinity and the Atonement as mysteries essential to man's salvation, but beyond their powers of comprehension? We once asked as zealous a Trinitarian as we have ever known, — a man of fine genius and fervent piety, — whether this might not be; and after pausing a little while, he replied, that he could not see why it might not. If, then, Trinitarians hold these doctrines as a mystery which they do not understand, they must cease to condemn us as heretics, who, under other and purely Scriptural terms, may believe as much as they; and if they hold them as intelligible, philosophical articles of belief,

they are bound to explain them as such, and to present them in such a way that they will not palpably contradict the doctrine of the Divine unity, and the plainest declarations of Scripture.

We would state one thing more, suggested by reading these reviews. We have a strong affection for the Congregational form of worship and church discipline. We believe it to be the form instituted by our Saviour, and observed by his apostles. It commends itself to our reason, and is endeared to us by our most hallowed associations. It is always, therefore, with pain that we see in any branch of the Congregational church symptoms of weakness or decay. These Orthodox clergymen repudiate us, but we cling to them still as Christian brethren. We do not need their patronage, and we lament their exclusiveness, — not because it shuts us out from the hope of salvation, but because it shuts us out from their sympathy and fraternal coöperation. We and they have the same work to do in the heritage left to us by common ancestors, and we would strengthen and cheer each other by our united counsels and prayers. We should all of us be the better for such a union. And we have felt this most forcibly in reading particularly the review in the *Observatory*. No clergyman in our denomination, occupying a position such as is held by most of the editors of that Review, could without public disgrace publish such an article. It would not be tolerated by our intelligent laymen ; and the clergyman, or the association of clergymen, who should publish it, would only bring upon themselves the odium they were laboring to bring upon another. Intelligent and liberal Orthodox laymen, we know, take the same view of the subject ; and a series of petty acts like this, of supercilious levity, intolerance, and bigotry, is seriously undermining the influence of the clergy among them, and driving them away to a church with which we have less sympathy than with any form of Congregationalism. Our New England clergy from the beginning have had great influence with the people, because of their reputation for learning and piety. But if, as in some of these reviews, they undertake to substitute abuse for argument, dogmatism for learning, the decisions of human councils for the words of Jesus and the apostles, and appeal, not to the reason, but to the prejudices of their readers, and, in language not to be mistaken, call for the excision from their body of one of the ablest and most devout of

their number, because, on subjects passing the limits of our human thought, he interprets Scriptural language differently from themselves, — if they go on in this direction, they must lose the confidence and respect of their people, and drive into the opposite extremes of Rationalism and Episcopacy, or Romanism, more souls than all their Evangelical Alliances, and Colporteurs, and Bible Societies can rescue. It is one of the mournful consequences of the forced division in our churches, that those whom we most need to preserve the balance in our separate congregations are driven off. A few of those who cling to the letter of the word would be useful in our more liberal congregations, that we might in our discourses and studies be kept closer to the Scriptures, and cherish a greater reverence for the precise words and terms of the sacred records; and our Orthodox brethren would be greatly assisted in the enlargement of their thoughts and the healthful freedom of their devotions, if they had among their hearers a greater proportion of educated, liberal, comprehensive minds. Their academies, their colleges, their theological schools, their churches, their homes, would then be the nurseries of a more generous and catholic piety; and such productions as two of those here reviewed would be condemned by none more severely than by some of the excellent men who, by their names at least, now make themselves responsible for them.

Why can there not be a manly, scholar-like, Christian discussion of the great subjects on which the different members of the Orthodox body are now at issue? Why the pitiable attempts, that we have so often seen, to out-vote, silence, and suppress objectionable matter, or objectionable members? The treatment of Dr. Bushnell's *Treatise on Christian Nurture*, the underhanded manœuvring in regard to Mr. Lesley, the conduct of the Essex Association towards the late Mr. Niles, are instances of a kind of management which must bring disgrace and odium on any body of men by whom it is approved. We do not find fault with them for disliking the *Treatise on Christian Nurture*, or for refusing to ordain Mr. Lesley. If they had come out openly and kindly, giving their reasons like Christian men, it would all have been well, and they would have been honored even by those differing from them. We see symptoms of a better order of things, and believe that there are now rising up in the Orthodox denomination men who, firm in the faith of their fathers, are ashamed



of these old practices, and are preparing to rest their doctrines less than ever on prescription, and more than ever on the broad principles of reason and revelation. They are the men who are to infuse a new spirit into the body with which they are connected, and to restore the faded glory of our New England churches, that, in the great contest of the age which is coming upon us between the religion of the Bible and the religion of an authoritative hierarchy, we may stand where our fathers stood, "fast in the liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free." Then may we hope for something like the good old times when Dr. Stiles, and Dr. Hopkins, and Dr. West, of Dartmouth, could meet at the house of a common friend, controvert each other's views with their strongest arguments, unite in prayer, and agree upon their exchange of pulpits.

J. H. M.

---

ART. VI.—THE PHILOSOPHY OF RELIGION.\*

THE disposition to consider all questions under a philosophical point of view is becoming more and more general. We might gather this from the title-pages of books, as indicating what the public is supposed to favor. Thus, instead of having a "dissertation," or "treatise," as the term formerly was, on this subject or that, we now have what is called its "philosophy";—"The Philosophy of Language," "The Philosophy of Trade," "The Philosophy of Health,"—even "The Philosophy of Courtship and Marriage." We see it also in the subject-matter of the books which are most in demand and most eagerly read, and in the sort of questions debated with the most interest and warmth,—especially by young men. Thirty years ago,—to go back no farther,—no publications for the use of theological students found a readier sale than critical works and commentaries on the Scriptures: now, these, as the booksellers tell us, are dead stock. Thirty years ago, the appearance of a new work in controversial divinity, or on the interpretation of the Old or New Testament, or on the external evidences of Christianity,

---

\* *The Philosophy of Religion.* By J. D. MORELL, A.M. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1849. 12mo. pp. 359.

if of acknowledged ability, would have made some noise in the literary circles : now, it makes none whatever, — unless, indeed, the avowed purpose is to bring the whole question under the criticism of what is called “a higher philosophy.”

This tendency of the public mind is everywhere giving rise to new parties and new schools in literature, politics, and religion. Without meaning to call in question the genius of Wordsworth or Coleridge, Byron or Shelley, there can be no doubt, we suppose, that these writers are indebted for not a little of their fame to a change in the public taste in favor of poetry of a more reflective or metaphysical cast. And so in the political world. In the convulsions which now agitate Europe, nothing is more noticeable than the absence of great leaders, — meaning, thereby, leaders capable of great action. This, however, is accounted for, in part at least, by the peculiar nature of the struggle, — not a war of races or dynasties, but of systems ; not, as in most previous revolutionary periods, a struggle for independence, or for political rights, or for bread, but a struggle between old and new ideas ; in which, of course, journalists and professors, men of science, and even poets, are the master spirits. In Hungary, — where alone the contest is of a different character, where they are agreed, and know what they are fighting for, — great leaders, in the usual acceptation of that title, are abundant. But the illustrations most in point are drawn from the new schools in theology. It is not that men would cast off old names, old dogmas, or old connections. Thus, the follower of Schleiermacher or Coleridge, among the Orthodox, claims to be as orthodox as ever, and to be as sincerely attached to the ancient symbols of the Church. His distinction consists in thinking to have rediscovered under these symbols a profound philosophy, which brings them into harmony with the true doctrine of the soul, and the advanced state of science in other respects. Primarily, therefore, it is neither the dogmas nor the forms, but the philosophy, of the Church, which he would have reformed. It is not, like most of the movements which have preceded it, a dogmatic or a critical movement, but, strictly speaking, a philosophical movement. Fanatics, even, and ultraists of every description, are now obliged, in order to obtain a favorable hearing, to put on the philosopher's cloak. It is nothing new for men to adopt non-resistance principles, disown civil government, or renounce animal food. All these things, and stranger

things than these, were done by some among the early reformers ; but with this remarkable difference : they professed to act under authority of Scripture ; whereas modern ultraists seldom appeal to the letter of Scripture, or to authority of any kind, being determined rather by abstract principles, or by certain newly discovered or newly assumed laws of the soul, or of the constitution of society.

To this general movement we are doubtless indebted for the work before us. We are glad, on several accounts, that it comes from an Orthodox divine, and not from a Unitarian, or a free-thinker. Not only will it be read more extensively, and by those who most need the information it contains, but also with less disposition to suspect it of meaning more or less than is said. Of the author himself we are likewise happy in being able to say, that his three publications, "*The History of Philosophy*," "*The Philosophical Tendencies of the Age*," and "*The Philosophy of Religion*," improve on each other ; the last manifesting more freedom and precision of thought than either of the preceding, a better understanding of the connection and relative importance of the problems, and, in general, a greater mastery over the entire subject. Even in the last, however, he is still liable to the charge of diffuseness and inexactness in language, and occasional oversights or blunders, which betray a haste of composition hardly to be excused in a treatise of this description. But the evil is not without its good. By avoiding, as much as possible, formal definitions, technical modes of expression, and a strictly scientific method, and adopting an easy, flowing, and popular style, he will probably hold the attention of many readers who could not otherwise have been induced to go through a metaphysical work. Indeed, when we consider that his object is to introduce among his countrymen a controversy which is not likely to end soon, and that the great obstacle to be overcome in the first instance is one growing out of the unaccustomedness of the English mind and the English language to discussions of this nature, we are not sure but that the book is a better one for its purpose than it would be, if it were better in itself.

Thus much is clear. The discussion itself, slow and reluctant as English and American theologians have been to take it up, is now fairly before the public, principally through the writings of the Orthodox, and must be entered on in good earnest by all parties. The stress of the controversy for the

next half-century will not be on the logical forms which the Christian doctrine shall assume, nor on the history or interpretation of the Scriptures, nor yet on the external evidences of a revelation, but on great previous questions which lie at the foundation of all religion. From the nature of the subject, not a little vague and presumptuous thought is to be expected, — crude theories, which strike at the root, not only of faith, but of morals and political order, the unsettling of some honest and well-disposed minds even in respect to first principles, and the consequent increase, for a time, of skepticism, or of mysticism as the only effectual shelter against skepticism. Nevertheless, the controversy will go on. Much of the declamation about trying hazardous experiments and agitating questions prematurely is to no purpose. Not only the progress of human inquiry, but the great changes it undergoes from age to age, and the new forms it puts on, obey, for the most part, laws which execute themselves. When men begin to think, they begin to question ; and their thinking and questioning go on together, until they reach, at last, the fundamental principles of all knowledge and belief. Agitators cannot do so much to precipitate this issue, alarmists cannot do so much to retard it, as is commonly supposed ; though it would be well, if we were rid of both. The danger would be next to nothing, if things were allowed to take their natural course. For obvious reasons, it may almost be laid down as an axiom, that a people are prepared for the discussion of any question which fairly comes up in their own thinking. If the question is not put into their mouths by others, if they have thought their way up to the problem, this fact alone is evidence that they are in a condition to understand its solution, and have a right to demand it ; and, consequently, that it ought not to be withheld.

That the turn which religious controversy is now taking will lead us to consider religion itself under new aspects is, on the whole, a recommendation. Some temporary inconveniences will doubtless grow out of this circumstance, — those especially which pertain to imperfectly formed conceptions, and the want of adequate terms to express our conceptions. The reason is obvious. New distinctions are to be made ; new relations are to be pointed out ; new facts are to be brought into notice and insisted on ; above all, new complex notions, new generalizations, are to be introduced, and the minds of the disputants are to become accustomed to



them, and to the names used to denote them. All this cannot be done in a day. In respect to terminology alone, one of two courses must be taken, either of which will be found to be attended with peculiar difficulties. If you conclude to retain the old terms, using them, however, in a new acceptance, you will not be able, for some time, so entirely to exclude old associations as to convey precisely what you mean. If, on the other hand, you determine to invent or adopt new terms, it will give to your diction a hard and strange look; some will think it to be unintelligible, because it is so to them; many will stigmatize it as mystical, merely because it is technical; and even the best informed and best disposed, so long as the conceptions and the language are unfamiliar, will read it with difficulty, and receive, perhaps, but a vague and confused impression. These are serious evils; but they are in their nature transient, and more than compensated for by the freshness and interest of a new discussion, and especially by the fact, that honest inquirers will enter upon it with minds to a degree untrammelled and uncommitted. Controversies do good; but most of this good is done before parties are formed in respect to them, or, at any rate, before party lines are distinctly and definitively drawn, and each party has become so accustomed to its peculiar views as to regard them, on this account, as the only natural and consistent views. Afterwards, at least if the controversy continues to be an active one, the party drill on both sides will be able to keep things nearly stationary as regards the main issues. Meanwhile, however, some collateral or previous question is almost sure to be started, which will lead to new investigations;—new issues are raised, new unions are formed, and a real progress is made.

Thus, by a succession of controversies, and not by the continuance of a single controversy, the truth prevails. Old controversies, like worn-out mines, can seldom be worked to advantage; the little gold which they yield is hardly worth the labor it costs. After a controversy has run its course, and every body interested in the question has become committed to one side or the other, and is ready with an argument for everything, and an answer to everything, conversions must be expected to be rare. Ancient grudges, excited passions, party associations, the point of honor, if nothing else, will make them so. Neither is it to any purpose to object, that there are those to whom the old controversy

would be new. Their knowledge of it would be new ; still they would know it as an old controversy, with its accumulated hoard of prejudices, mutual recriminations, one-sided statements, and subtle distinctions and evasions ; so that it would be hardly possible for them to entertain the question, as it was entertained in the beginning by honest minds. Accordingly, it is seldom that errors die out until long after the controversy expressly directed against them, and which did good service in first exposing their falsity and loosening their hold on the public mind, has been allowed to subside. Take Calvinism for an example. It is since the Calvinistic controversy, properly so called, has slept, that some of the most offensive and objectionable parts of that system have been silently and almost universally abandoned. And this is the general rule. Theological errors seldom fall totally and irrecoverably, except with the fall of some more fundamental error on which they depended.

For these reasons we welcome the prospect of a new controversy, and the more so, as the subject of it is likely to be *the philosophy of religion*. But as this phrase is used by good writers in widely different acceptations, and often vaguely and indiscriminately, it will be necessary to state here, with some explicitness, what we understand it to signify and to include.

Philosophy is a word for which we are indebted, as every one knows, to the modesty of Pythagoras. Thinking the title of *wise man*, which had been borne by the sages who preceded him, too assuming, he was content to be called a *lover of wisdom*, or one who desired to know. Amidst the various characters of men, there is a select number who, despising all other pursuits, assiduously apply themselves to the study of nature, and the search after wisdom : " These," said Pythagoras, " are the persons whom I call philosophers." Cicero, following Plato, and expressing himself more precisely, makes philosophy to be " a knowledge of things divine and human, with their causes." Thus understood, it is neither more nor less than *science* ; that is, precise, thorough, and systematic knowledge. This is a common, perhaps the most common, signification of the term, as used by the best English writers, especially if to designate a general subject, or in the title-pages of books. By philosophy in general is meant science in general ; by natural philosophy is meant natural science ; and by moral philosophy, moral science.

Dr. Brown's "Lectures on the Philosophy of the Human Mind" might just as well have been entitled "Lectures on the Science of the Human Mind," these terms being used interchangeably throughout the work. And so in religion. By the *philosophy of religion* is often meant the science of religion, or theology, properly so called, meaning thereby the whole of theology, natural and revealed. Those writers, for example, who oppose the introduction of theology into the pulpit, commonly allege as a reason, that theology is not religion, but only the philosophy of religion; and this is doubtless true in one sense of that phrase, but not in the sense in which we use it.

Another and more restricted acceptance of the term *philosophy* was introduced by the Christian Fathers, and afterwards adopted and sanctioned by the scholastic divines. In most cases, when they speak of philosophy absolutely, and especially when they allude to it as a rival to Christianity, they do not mean science in general, but human and worldly science (*scientia mundana*), in contradistinction to the Christian and divine (*scientia divina*). In other words, it stands for science as developed by the unassisted faculties of man, and, when used in connection with religion, for the science of religion, considered independently of the light and authority of revelation. This distinction still lingers, we believe, in most minds, as the predominant one, whenever philosophy and religion are compared together, or the hope is expressed that sooner or later they will be reconciled. Thus Guizot: — "To a greater depth than some of our contemporaries are willing to allow, Philosophy is ready to become seriously and sincerely religious. Like Catholicism, like Protestantism, she will not change her nature; she will remain Philosophy, that is to say, free thought, and only drawing from her own resources, in whatever field she may labor. But in the field of religious questions, she perceives that she has often been very short-sighted and very trifling; that neither impiety nor indifference are true science; that the proudest rationalism may abase itself before God, and that there is philosophy in faith." Philosophy is here supposed to draw from her own resources an entire system of religion, — religion within the limits of reason, the religion of nature, or, as it is usually called, deism. Such a system of religion is nothing but a system of philosophy. Hence the philosophy of such a religion may be said to comprehend all the

reasonings or intuitions on which the religion itself rests. Here, then, we have another and not uncommon sense of the phrase under consideration, but, again we say, not that in which it is used by us.

For distinctness' sake, we have thought it best to begin by stating what we do not mean by *the philosophy of religion*. We do not mean the science of religion, natural and revealed, — religion logically defined, harmonized, and reduced to a system, or *theology*, as that term is commonly understood. Neither do we mean natural religion alone, or so much of the science of religion as philosophy teaches; nor yet the sum of the reasonings or intuitions on which these teachings depend. The philosophy of religion, as we understand it in this connection, relates exclusively to the ultimate grounds of religion, — to what must be proved, postulated, or unconsciously assumed, before we are in a condition rationally and consistently to enter on the discussion of religious questions, properly so called. Its function is to deal with the great previous questions, which a man must answer one way or another before he is prepared, we do not say to solve religious problems, properly so called, but even so much as logically to entertain them. The philosophy of religion is the science of the essential nature and primordial conditions of religion, and so is not to be regarded as a part of the proof or the exposition of religion, properly so called, but as something which must be known or assumed before the proof or exposition is begun. It has to do, not with the superstructure, but with the foundations; not with the formal statement of the argument or doctrine of religion, — not with what religion teaches, or, properly speaking, includes, — but with what it *presupposes*.

The topics which come under this head divide themselves naturally into two classes: those which are common to the science of religion and to other sciences, and those which pertain exclusively to the science of religion.

Bacon seems to have had the former in view where he says, in his "Advancement of Learning," — "Because the distributions and partitions of knowledge are not like several lines that meet in one angle, and so touch but in one point; but are like branches of a tree that meet in a stem, which hath a dimension and quantity of entireness and continuance, before it come to discontinue and break itself into arms and boughs: therefore it is good, before we enter into the former distribution, to erect and constitute one universal science, by the



name of *Philosophia Prima*, primitive or summary philosophy, as the main and common way, before we come where the ways part and divide themselves. Which science," he adds, "whether I should report as deficient or not, I stand doubtful." On this point many "stand doubtful" still; yet it is obvious, that if we would begin at the beginning, we must begin here. Whatever the human mind knows or conceives, it knows or conceives by virtue of its own laws and powers. Hence it is driven, by a necessity growing out of its own nature, to seek the ultimate foundation of all that it knows or conceives in a knowledge of itself as a distinct object of study. No matter how high, no matter how low, the thing to be known, our knowledge of it, both as regards its extent and legitimacy, depends, in the last analysis, on the validity and reach of our knowing faculties. In a logical view of the constitution of the sciences, it is not enough, therefore, merely to apply these faculties; we must begin by understanding the faculties themselves, so far at least as to know the laws and conditions of their development. Now it is precisely here, in the science of mind, that is to say, in the science which, as we have seen, is at the foundation of all sciences, that some of the most perplexing problems occur, — problems, too, which have been solved differently by the great masters of thought; and according as we accept one or another of these solutions, our subsequent conclusions in every field of thought will be materially affected and determined. Consequently, the problems themselves, as great preliminary questions, come fairly within the scope of what is here understood by *the philosophy of religion*.

One of these problems respects what has been termed *the fundamental law of human development*. M. Comte, the learned and ingenious founder and expositor of the so-called *Positive Philosophy*, has undertaken to demonstrate, that, according to this law, every science manifests itself under three successive phases, — the theological, the metaphysical, and the positive. In other words, men begin by making God the sole and immediate cause of all things; they next think to refer all changes to certain general and abstract potencies, or metaphysical entities, as their cause; at last, they dismiss all thought of cause, not only of first cause, but of second causes, as nugatory and vain, — nay more, discard the very term utterly and for ever, contenting themselves henceforth with the study of the laws and conditions of the cor-

relation of things and the sequence of events. Whoever adopts this solution of the problem must hold, as a necessary consequence, that religion, as well as metaphysics, is destined to die a natural death ; — not by being denied and confuted, but by being ignored ; not by the answer given to religious questions, but by the fact that the time is coming when no religious questions will be asked. This philosophy has been introduced into England by Lewes in his “ Biographical History of Philosophy,” who avows himself a convert to the system ; and still more effectually, because more covertly, by Mill, whose “ System of Logic ” has just been welcomed and accepted by M. Littré, the ablest of the French disciples of Comte, as the logic of the Positive school. And as the general tone and complexion of the Positive Philosophy, apart from its religious aspects, fall in with the strong empirical bias of the English mind, its impatience of abstractions and German metaphysics and mysticism of every kind, we cannot help thinking that religion, in England and amongst us, is a hundredfold more in danger from this quarter, than from transcendentalism or pantheism. At any rate, the question on the merits of this system, with its corollary in respect to the ultimate fate of all religions, is now an open question ; we cannot avert the discussion, if we would ; — a discussion which must be expected to hold a prominent place in the controversies of the next fifty years.

Another unsettled problem, pertaining, though not exclusively, to the philosophy of religion, comprehends the whole doctrine of rational intuitions, the *à priori* element of intelligence, or, as Mr. Morell calls it, “ the intuitional consciousness.” Locke retained the term *intuition*, but not the reality, as it is understood at the present day, — certainly not an adequate foundation for it ; and some of his English followers, perceiving this, have discarded the term. The question is, whether the mind, by virtue of innate laws, and on occasion of experience, can attain by its own activity to universal and necessary truths. Be it observed, that these truths are not the “ innate ideas,” so successfully, and we may add, so easily, exploded by Locke in the first book of his Essay. That eminent philosopher does not appear to have made a distinction — which, however, would seem to be obvious enough on being stated — between innate principles of knowledge and an innate knowledge of principles. The Scotch metaphysicians have done something to elucidate this

subject in what they have said of "first principles" and "fundamental laws of belief"; but the work, as left by them, is essentially incomplete. They have not even so much as attempted a new and thorough analysis of the intellect; neither have they given a perfect list of the intuitive judgments, or the marks whereby these judgments may be infallibly distinguished from universal prejudices; in defect of which, truths purporting to rest on such judgments can hardly be said to have scientific validity. This defect Kant and his German successors have undertaken to supply, and the results of their labors, with slight modifications, have been introduced into France by Cousin, and into England by Coleridge, Whewell, and Morell. Thus far, however, as it appears, with but limited and partial success; so much so, as to convince us that if a philosophy, inculcating consistently and intelligibly moral and religious intuitions, is ever to prevail in England or in this country, it must be a philosophy of domestic, not of foreign growth. In any event, we see before us the occasion and the materials of a long, difficult, and sharply contested controversy; and the conclusions arrived at will not stop in philosophy, but materially affect, for good or for evil, men's views of the foundations of morals and religion.

Intimately connected with the preceding is a third question, which philosophy must settle for every inquiry dealing with realities, and for religion among the rest, and which belongs, therefore, to the philosophy of religion. It relates to the grounds of certitude, restricting the meaning of this term to the assurance we have of the real existence of objects answering to our perceptions and our belief. Locke is disposed to make merry with this difficulty. "If," says he, "any one will be so skeptical as to distrust his senses, and to affirm that all we see and hear, feel and taste, think and do, during our whole being, is but the series and deluding appearances of a long dream, whereof there is no reality, and therefore will question the existence of all things, or our knowledge of any thing, I must desire him to consider, that if all be a dream, then he doth but dream that he makes the question; and so it is not much matter that a waking man should answer him." Nevertheless, it was Locke's doctrine of ideas which prepared the way for Berkeley's skepticism in respect to the existence of matter, and afterwards for Hume's skepticism in respect to all existences except im-

pressions and ideas. The last awoke Kant from his dogmatic slumbers. So far, however, was he from being able to dissipate the skepticism thus introduced, that his famous "Critic of Pure Reason" only seemed to make it more radical and more hopeless, by demonstrating, as it was thought, that *certitude*, in the restricted sense in which the term is here used, — a certitude considered as involving the objective validity of human knowledge, — is impossible. An attempt has since been made by the French Eclectics to recover external realities ; that is to say, to attain to objective as well as subjective knowledge, by means of "the impersonal reason" ; but, as it is generally thought, without success. More recently still, Sir William Hamilton, by clearing up or improving upon Reid's doctrine, appears to have made a step of real advance, and in the right direction, in his distinction between *presentative* and *representative* knowledge. According to him, the object in perception is not known through the medium of an idea, understanding thereby either a distinct entity, or merely a modification of the brain or the mind, but immediately and in itself, as being actually present to the living and sentient organism when and where it is perceived ; so that the real existence of an object is supposed in the very fact of perception, and not merely the real existence of an idea. Taking his departure from this theory of perception, and arguing upon real or fancied analogies between the intuitions of sense and those of reason, Mr. Morell thinks to establish the reality of spiritual things on the same foundation of certitude. Facts, information, tradition, the Scriptures, may all be necessary to bring spiritual objects and the spiritual world within the field of our inward vision ; but when there, they are known really to exist by the fact that they are also immediately perceived in themselves, as being actually present and gazed upon by the soul.

"Such," says he, "is the real principle of catholicity, as applied to the verification of Christian truth. *Christian* ideas have incontestably proved themselves to pertain to the highest form of man's religious consciousness. Humanity itself has paid homage to them by relinquishing all other forms of worship, just as it has advanced in intelligence and civilization ; and amongst all the conceptions which have sprung up in the Christian world, *those* bear the undoubted marks of certitude, which live on through every era ; which, instead of appearing for a little and



then dying away, develop themselves in one steady course through the march of the ages; and which always, by their depth, intensity, and inherent splendor, cast their shadows before them, and point out the religious course of the future. Thus, when we see the *world* tending in its spiritual development to Christianity, — when, further, we see the dim and imperfect conceptions, which have attached themselves to Christianity, dropping away, or becoming penetrated with moral idea, — and when, lastly, we can single out certain great principles of truth, which appear to be the *foci* of Christian light, which have unfolded themselves to a brighter realization from age to age, and towards which the whole Christian world is still gazing, as the great points around which their spiritual life revolves, — these, assuredly, are the very principles which bear upon them the marks of *true universality*, because they are *those to which humanity entire incessantly tends.*” — pp. 294, 295.

And again :—

“Place this principle by the side of that which rests upon the individual reason, and it gives us at once an objective centre around which our individual speculations may securely revolve. It is *an anchor* to the soul, which, while it allows the individual to toss about at pleasure upon the surface of mere logical argumentation, yet permits him not to drift away from the proper track, or suffer shipwreck of his faith in all that is eternal and Divine. Place, again, the same principle by the side of *tradition*, and it exhibits an equal power to curb its errors and extract its real advantages. The principle of tradition looks upon the truth as something already *perfect and fixed*, and then gropes its way backwards amidst the gloom and uncertainty of past ages in order to find it. Alas! what can result from such a process but an interminable uncertainty as to what we are to select and what to refuse? And even if we did succeed in grasping just that which we searched for, what would it be but the dead and withered skeleton of a truth, which once, indeed, possessed vitality, but which now, drawn forth from the sepulchres of the past, has no life in the present consciousness of humanity, — no power either to subdue the world, or to complete the organism of the Church to the full and perfect stature of Christ? We look to the past, not as an *authority*, but as an aid to interpret the present. Convinced that truth *to man* is progressive, we gaze with intense interest upon the course it has already run, and delight to trace its bright and glorious pathway down to its present stage of development. But why do we do this? Not because the *realized truth* of any past age will satisfy the present, but because we can the better understand, by the light of history, what is the most advanced thinking of this our age, and what is the true

elevation to which our religious consciousness has now arrived. We trust *not* to the catholic thinking of the past ; we trust rather to that of the present, which contains in its embrace the fruits of the past together with the seeds of the future. Assuredly, if there be a rhythmic development of ideas in the world, it were worse than vain to read the course of history backwards, and be always looking to the vestments of worn-out ideas, instead of interpreting the living voice of God as it speaks to us in the phenomena of the present hour." — pp. 298, 299.

Thus far, we have glanced at certain problems which, though they come up for consideration in the philosophy of religion, are also common to philosophy in general, considered as the science of fundamental truths. Others are more appropriate and peculiar ; such as the conception of an infinite, perfect, absolute Being, which must not only be laid down in words, but developed as clearly as possible, and vindicated against all objections, as the fundamental principle of natural theology. Those who are solely intent on the argument from design appear sometimes to think that they can prove the existence of God in the same manner, in all respects, in which they can prove the existence of the watch-maker ; but it is not so. Suppose you have proved that the world had a creator ; it does not follow that this creator is God. Besides, the question may still be raised, Who created the Creator ? And with this question hanging over your head, it is just as easy ultimately to account for the existence of the world without a creator as with one. In order to prove the existence of a God, you must prove the existence of an absolute Being, — that is to say, of a Being who has the ground of his existence in himself ; so that, from his very nature, all questions respecting the cause or the beginning of his existence will be self-contradictory : they need not be answered, because they cannot consistently be asked.

There are also several unsettled fundamental questions belonging peculiarly to revealed religion, which it is the office of philosophy to take up and discuss. One of these respects the true theory of inspiration ; meaning thereby the way in which the human mind is made the channel of a special revelation of divine truth. And here we confess to some perplexity, not merely in making out the true theory, but still more in making out what the common theory really is, as held by Unitarians, and by rational and enlightened Christians generally. The doctrine of verbal and plenary inspiration would seem to be plain enough ; though even here we

are not without some misgivings, inasmuch as we have never met with a single respectable writer professing this doctrine who adhered consistently to the only obvious sense which the words will bear. Again, we think we can understand that view of inspiration which makes it to be nothing but native genius, excited and directed by nothing but natural agencies, — that is to say, no inspiration at all. But of the generally received theories falling between these extremes, there is not one, as it seems to us, which admits of much precision or consistency, either in statement or application, which does not allow in one what it condemns in another, leaving it for common sense to decide, after all, what shall be received as divine, without deciding whose common sense it shall be; nay, more, there is not one, we suspect, which is entirely satisfactory to those who hold it. The whole question, as much, perhaps, as any other, calls for new and thorough elucidation; and this we say after having read Mr. Morell's chapter on the subject, probably the most valuable and instructive in the volume. We shall copy a few passages, which, especially when considered as coming from an Orthodox theologian, and a favorite pupil of Dr. Chalmers, are certainly worthy of attention, and full of encouragement.

Of the doctrine professed and advocated, as we suppose, in most of the Orthodox pulpits in this country, he thus speaks:—

“This theory of verbal dictation has been so generally abandoned by the thoughtful in the present day, that it is not necessary to recapitulate here the innumerable objections which crowd upon us as we proceed to deal with the details of manuscripts, various readings, translations, and the gradual formation of the Canon during the first two centuries of the Christian era.”—  
p. 151.

“The reason why many have been so anxious to represent the *letter* of the Bible as inspired is, that there may be a *fixed standard* for truth in the world. They do not consider that the letter can never serve as a standard for the *spirit* of Christianity, — that the two are altogether incommensurable, — that the letter *alone*, in fact, never *has* secured the unity of the Church, but that the unity we so much yearn after comes only through the development of the religious *life*. This being the case, where is the value or the reasonableness of laying so great a stress upon the letter, when, after all, we *must* be brought, on any hypothesis, to one and the same conclusion, namely, that the Spirit of

Truth, interpreted by Divine aid, and perceived through the awakened religious consciousness of true believers, is the real and essential revelation, — the sole basis of Christian unity, — the appeal to which we all, in the end, practically repair? Whether the words be dictated or not, there is, therefore, exactly the same necessity for another and spiritual appeal; which is, in fact, nothing but affirming, in the spirit of our whole previous analysis, that, as all revelation must be made to the intuitional faculty, mere material and logical appliances, whether in the form of writing or speaking, can only avail as *means* towards the realization of the great end implied in the idea of *a revelation from God.*” — pp. 153, 154.

With reference to another popular theory, he expresses himself thus : —

“The idea is entertained by many, that a distinct commission to write was in every instance given to the sacred penmen by God; that each book came forth with a specific impress of Deity upon it; and that the whole of the Canon of Scripture was gradually completed by *so many distinct and decisive acts of Divine ordination.* Now the evidence of this opinion we regard as totally defective, and can only ascribe its growth and progress in the Church to the influence of a low and mechanical view of the whole question of inspiration itself.

“Let any one look through the whole of the books composing the Old and New Testaments, and consider how many can lay claim to any *distinct* commission, — and, consequently, how their inspiration can be at all defended *if it be made to rest upon this condition.* That Moses had a Divine commission to institute the Jewish theocracy, and to give both the moral and ceremonial law to the people, we do not doubt. But that does not prove any Divine commission to write the whole of the Pentateuch as we now have it. In fact, it is quite certain that Moses did *not* write the whole of it at all. There is, at least, a probability that the history of the creation was compiled from earlier documents or traditions; and, as to the conclusion of this record, we well know that Moses could not possibly have penned the account of his own death and burial. Added to this, it is by no means certain that ‘the book of the law,’ as occasionally referred to in Jewish history, was at all identical with the Pentateuch *as a whole*, which the best critics, in fact, have generally concurred in referring to a much later date. We do not, by these remarks, throw the slightest shade upon the inspired source of the Pentateuch; — no book of Scripture, perhaps, has greater internal arguments to vindicate it. All we mean is, that the inspiration here involved did not spring from any outward commission to write that particular



book ; but only from the Divine light which was granted to the age, and to the mind of the author, — a gift which he was left to make use of as necessity or propriety might suggest." — pp. 155, 156.

His own views are briefly given in the following words : —

" We have thus attempted to show that the proper idea of inspiration, as applied to the Holy Scriptures, does not include either miraculous powers, verbal dictation, or any distinct commission from God ; we have only to recur, therefore, to the definition already proposed, which regards inspiration as consisting in the impartation of clear intuitions of moral and spiritual truth to the mind by extraordinary means. According to this view of the case, inspiration, *as an internal phenomenon*, is perfectly consistent with the natural laws of the human mind ; it is a higher potency of a certain form of consciousness, which every man, to some degree, possesses. The supernatural element consists in the *extraordinary influences* employed to create these lofty intuitions, to bring the mind of the subject into a perfect harmony with truth, and that, too, at a time when, under ordinary circumstances, such a state could not possibly have been enjoyed. The personal experience of the life, preaching, character, sufferings, death, and resurrection of Christ, together with the remarkable effusion of spiritual influence which followed his ascension, were assuredly most extraordinary instrumentalities, wonderfully adapted, moreover, to work upon the minds of the apostles, and raise them to a state of spiritual perception and sensibility, such as has never been fully realized at any other period in the world's history. It was these minds, thus prepared, who first founded and instructed the Church ; and the New Testament Scriptures were written long after Christianity had established itself, and after thousands had been brought under its power, in order to represent, and, so far as possible, *to retain*, the bright impressions of apostolic men, after they should have passed away to their eternal rest." — pp. 159, 160.

" So far as inspiration consists in an exalted state of man's intuitional faculties, there is undoubtedly a *resemblance*, generically considered, between inspiration in the Scriptural sense, and what are sometimes denominated the inspirations of genius. Genius, as we regard it, consists in the possession of a remarkable power of intuition with reference to some particular object ; a power which arises from the inward nature of a man being brought into unusual harmony with that object in its reality and its operations. The natural philosopher manifests his genius, not by his power of analysis and verification, but by seizing distant analogies, by ascending with a sudden leap to general conceptions, by

embodying his inward ideas in some theory or hypothesis, which forms the basis and gives the direction to inductive investigation. It is, in fact, the harmony of his being with nature in her wondrous operations which enables him to grasp those *conceptions*, on the accuracy of which all scientific research so much depends; this harmony manifesting itself in that increased power of intuition, by which truth is seen in the concrete previous to its being verified by a legitimate induction. In the same manner does the poet of human life and destiny, by an elevation of mind above the influence of prevailing opinions, and a deep inward sympathy with human existence in its nature and development, unfold in spontaneous flashes of spiritual light the most secret workings of the mind and heart of humanity. Artistic genius is generically of the same order. It is the immediate realization of an ideal beauty, which it strives to express in an outward form.

“In affirming that the inspiration of the ancient seers and the chosen apostles was analogous with these phenomena, we are in no way diminishing its heavenly origin, or losing sight of the supernatural agency by which it was produced. We are only affirming what is constantly done in the case of outward miracles themselves,—that God employs natural means whenever it is possible to do so, in order to accomplish even his supernatural purposes. The power of intuition, in its pure and integral state, would imply a direct and complete recipiency of truth whenever presented to the mind. Let there be a due purification of the moral nature,—a perfect harmony of the spiritual being with the mind of God,—a removal of all inward disturbances from the heart, and what is to prevent or disturb this immediate intuition of Divine things? And what do we require in inspiration more than this? or what can more certainly assure us of its heavenly origin? So far from detracting aught from its reality or its authority, the whole fact now becomes, on the contrary, replete with a new moral interest. Not only do we now comprehend its nature; not only do we feel its real sublimity; not only does it rise from a mere mechanical force to a phenomenon instinct with spiritual grandeur;—but we are likewise taught, that in proportion as our own hearts are purified, and our own nature brought into harmony with truth, we may ourselves indefinitely approach the same elevation. ‘Blessed are the pure in heart,’ said our Saviour, ‘for they shall see God.’”—pp. 173–175.

Passing from the manner in which revelation is communicated to that in which it is proved, we find ourselves still in the domain of the philosophy of religion. If we would not reason in a circle, the proof of a revelation must be established without assuming its authority; consequently, this

proof must be established by philosophy alone. Sir James Mackintosh has said of Butler's "Analogy," that it is "the most original and profound work extant in any language on the philosophy of religion." There are parts of that immortal work of which we should not think this to be extravagant praise; but it certainly does not apply to the treatise as a whole. Taken as a whole, it is a celebrated illustration of what logicians call *argumentum ad hominem*; he reasons from the concessions of infidels; but what the infidels of his day — those, for example, of Bolingbroke's school — conceded, the infidels of the present day do not. And besides, Bishop Butler does not profess to give the philosophy of analogy, or to answer to subtle cavils which have been advanced respecting the legitimacy of extending analogical reasonings to a life and a world beyond human experience. Then the miracles; — who does not know how many difficult and perplexing questions are still in agitation on this subject, — questions which it is the province of philosophy to consider and decide? What is a miracle? Are miracles possible? What sort and what amount of evidence is necessary in order to prove a miracle? And what will a miracle prove when it is itself proved? Even if we say that it is a false philosophy which has raised these questions, and made them to seem difficult and perplexing, we cannot make this appear except by showing wherein the philosophy complained of is false; — which would not be to deny or exclude all philosophy, but to substitute for a false philosophy the true.

Thus have we rapidly indicated a few of the leading topics which the philosophical movement in religion will be likely to bring up for discussion, our purpose here being merely to give some just notion of the scope and extent of the argument.

To the whole it may be objected, that religion is not a matter of philosophy, but a matter of the affections and of faith, every man's salvation depending, in the last result, not on the activity or concurrence of his understanding, but on his willingness to be led. There is truth here as well as error. We would not be behind the foremost to insist on the importance and necessity of a teachable disposition, the meekness of faith, a willingness to be led, — provided, only, that "we know whom we have believed." But it is one thing to be willing to be led, and quite another to be willing to be led blindfold. It is one thing to be willing to receive

the *truth*, and quite another to be willing to receive truth or error indiscriminately. To take upon trust whatever is offered us under the name of religion, is to put all religions on a level. Undoubtedly, after all that has been said and done, a considerable proportion of mankind must take their religion, in point of fact, as they do their morals and politics, substantially on trust. Such persons do not receive Christianity through instruction in its principles, which they are afterwards to apply ; they receive its principles and application together. They reenact the religion which prevails around them, not in the form of an understood religion, but in the form of an applied religion. With persons of this description, we hardly need say, everything like philosophical discussion is out of place, and worse than useless. It is out of place, because they neither want it nor need it, not feeling any of those speculative difficulties which it is the immediate purpose of such discussions to remove. It is also worse than useless, because the danger is, that it will unsettle everything, and settle nothing, inducing in them one of the worst and most hopeless forms of skepticism ; — we mean, a suspicion that they have been imposed upon and misled, coupled with a consciousness of their own utter incompetency to set themselves right.

Such, however, are not the bulk of the intelligent laymen and men of business in this country. They are accustomed to think for themselves, and, as a necessary consequence, have their speculative, as well as their practical, difficulties ; and the most formidable of these speculative difficulties relate not to the interpretation of texts, or the logical statement of doctrine, but to more fundamental questions. A much larger number, than most persons would be willing to allow, are ready to say that Unitarianism is true, or that Calvinism is true, or that Methodism is true, *if any religion is true*. They have their reserved doubts respecting points which are vital to the whole system ; and until these doubts are distinctly met and removed, the system itself — though they should make up their minds ever so confidently as to its details — is not likely to have much influence on their conduct. We make too much of this distinction between speculative and practical difficulties. Speculative difficulties become practical, when, as in the case here supposed, they hinder a man from coming under the power of any form of Christianity.

It is a common opinion that Unitarians have been more inclined than any other sect to build on philosophy instead



of revelation ; but this is not according to history. Faustus Socinus was, we believe, among the first explicitly to maintain man's incompetency to discover by his unassisted faculties either the Divine character or the Divine existence. The fact is thus stated and commented on by Henry More : — “ 'T is most certain that the Socinians are a dry, strait-laced people ; and for want of philosophy, and of that better spirit which inclines men to religion even from their natural genius, are most what legulious interpreters of the Scripture ; though they think none comparable to themselves. How meanly they are appointed for these pretensions, the father of them may witness against them ; who was of so mean and sunk a genius, that he denied the existence of God could be proved or discovered by the light of natural reason, though it be point-blank against the Scripture.” We are not aware that any modern Unitarians have followed Socinus to the extent of denying the natural evidences for the being of God ; but several have called in question our competency to take another step on this ground, — to prove, for example, that God is good or just, or even to settle the grounds of ordinary morality. Thus Gilbert Wakefield : — “ The reason why I never took any pleasure in moral ethics, and would not give one penny for all the morality in the world, is because there is no foundation for virtue or immortality but in revelation ; and therefore I could never see any advantage from moral writings.” It may seem unaccountable to some that a sect so generally suspected of exalting reason above revelation, in matters of faith, should yet be found in fact to rely upon it, apart from revelation, so little. But a moment's reflection will clear up this seeming paradox. The more nearly a believer reduces Christianity to a bare authoritative republication of natural religion, — for example, to giving us assurance of a future state and the moral government of God, both of which Bishop Butler includes in natural religion, — the more he will be inclined to magnify the importance and necessity of such authoritative republication ; for it is only in this way that he can account to himself for the wonderful interposition and amazing sacrifices by which it was accomplished.

Still we have no doubt that Unitarians, in the movement which it has been our object to indicate and welcome, will do their part. They have already gained much by an almost universal change from the philosophy of Priestley to that of

Price. It is said of Dr. Channing, that the reading of Price, when he was a student at college, first opened his eyes upon the dignity and capacities of the human soul. Indeed, in a practical view of the subject, there would seem to be no such thing as not taking sides in this controversy. The stoutest decryer and despiser of metaphysics will hardly deny that the questions referred to above, and others like them, do really exist ; that they lie at the foundation of all religion, and must be answered in one way or another, either expressly or by implication. Accordingly, the only alternative left us would seem to be, not whether we will answer these questions or not, but whether we will answer them understandingly or not. Moreover, looking merely at its sectarian aspects, Unitarians have everything to hope and nothing to fear from a thorough discussion of the philosophy of religion. Possibly one consequence will be, that their own views will become in some respects more serious and evangelical through the deeper insight thus gained into "the mystery of godliness." But the leading and most noticeable result to be expected is, the decay and final subversion of those artificial and complicated systems of belief which are unable to bear the touch of first principles. What is called the Unitarian controversy has done, and is still doing, a good work ; but it is not by this agency alone that the errors of modern Orthodoxy are to be swept away. In the providence of God, these errors, like all others, are destined to fall ; not so much, however, by being directly impugned, as by the fall, one after another, and through a better understanding of the philosophy of religion, of the more radical and fundamental errors on which they depend.

J. W.

---

ART. VII.—HERSCHEL'S OUTLINES OF ASTRONOMY.\*

IT is unfortunately too often the case, that those who have attained to high culture in any department of knowledge find it irksome to clothe their thoughts in a popular form, and to communicate in ordinary language with the public. This

---

\* *Outlines of Astronomy.* By SIR JOHN F. W. HERSCHEL. London. 1849. pp. 661.

arises in part from the difficulty of expressing themselves in common words with that nicety to which they are accustomed and which their habit of mind demands ; but still more from the fact, that the talents and taste which stimulate to original researches are seldom found combined with the rhetorical acquirements which are necessary to fix the attention of differently constituted minds. For the teacher, a certain diffuseness is indispensable. His vocation requires him, as Fichte says, "not to communicate his idea as the author does, abstractly and in the one perfect conception under which it presents itself to his own mind, — but he must mould, express, and clothe it in an endless variety of forms, so as to bring it home, under some one of these garbs, to those by whose present state of culture he must be guided in the exercise of his calling. And, above all, he must possess the creative or artistic talent of the scholar."

In consequence of this repugnance to diffuse knowledge on the part of those whose calling it is to increase it, the second class of scholars has arisen, — the class who receive from the original discoverer and distribute to their fellow-men. Their profession is in itself a noble one, because without it the first would labor without benefit to their race ; but, in consequence of their lower degree of culture, much error becomes intermixed with the knowledge they diffuse, in the very process of distribution.

When, therefore, a man of science, of high attainments, an original investigator, devotes himself with earnestness to the work of adapting to popular comprehension his own hard-earned knowledge, his labors are entitled to the most respectful consideration, and, if they answer their purpose, will be sure of the gratitude of the community.

It was with high gratification that we received, some time since, the announcement of a new popular work on astronomy, by Sir John Herschel. His reputation for versatility of talent and elegance of scholarship, and his past labors in astronomy and photography, have gained for him an enviable position ; and, unlike most men of equal eminence, he has striven to diffuse the knowledge which he has labored to increase. If there be any one from whom the public would be warranted in anticipating a thorough, accurate, and elegant popular work on astronomy, in the English language, it is Sir John Herschel. The "Discourse on the Study of Natural Philosophy" was published fifteen or twenty years

ago ; and the author, occupying as he does a distinguished position among European astronomers, and possessing the authority of a doubly illustrious name, has unquestionably exerted, through this book, a highly beneficial influence upon the public mind.

In April last, the work appeared, whose title stands at the head of this article, — a work which professes to be an extension of the “Treatise on Astronomy,” formerly published. The author says that the “Treatise” has been revised and remodelled, and much new matter introduced ; that the parts relating to the lunar and planetary perturbations have been rewritten upon a far more matured and comprehensive plan ; and that those on sidereal and nebular astronomy have been brought up to the present state of our knowledge.

We have carefully read the book, and do not hesitate to say that we are disappointed. The mechanical execution is beautiful ; the text is comparatively free from typographical errors ; the plates and maps are finely engraved ; and the appearance of the volume must make an agreeable impression. But throughout the work, or, at least, throughout the new parts of it, the indications of inaccuracy are too numerous to allow us to place implicit confidence in any statement before verifying it.

Of the style we do not propose to speak. It may suffice to say that it is very unequal. While some passages are exquisitely beautiful and interesting, or thrillingly eloquent, others are so obscure as to be almost unintelligible. A single example will illustrate our meaning : —

“Now, though we cannot see the path of a star in the heavens, we can wait till the star itself crosses the field of view, and seize the moment of its passage to place the intersection of its wires so that the star shall traverse it ; by which, when the telescope is well clamped, we equally well secure the position of its diurnal circle as if we continued to see it ever so long.” — p. 99.

Some of the expressions rivet the reader's attention, and compel his admiration by their felicity and singular aptitude, while others seem, at least to an American ear, almost pendent, as when the author speaks (p. 388) of “the *orthogonal* [? perpendicular] component of the disturbing force,” or says (p. 405) that it is impossible to give any idea of “the analytical conduct” of Lagrange. We notice that



Sir John uses Dr. Whewell's word "thermotics." Why not "thermics"? And, if the word *optics*, in the sense of the science of light, be discarded, "photics" would seem more convenient than "photology," and quite as conformable to established analogy.

The introduction is reprinted with but slight change from the former work. It is a beautiful chapter, clear and concise, informing beginners in astronomy what they have a right to expect from an elementary work on this science.

"Its utmost pretension," says Herschel, "is to place them on the threshold of this particular wing of the temple of Science, or rather on an eminence exterior to it, whence they may obtain something like a general notion of its structure; or, at most, to give those, who may wish to enter, a ground-plan of its accesses, and put them in possession of the password. Admission to its sanctuary, and to the privileges and feelings of a votary, is only to be gained by one means, — *sound and sufficient knowledge of mathematics, the great instrument of all exact inquiry, without which no man can ever make such advances in this or any other of the higher departments of science, as can entitle him to form an independent opinion on any subject of discussion within their range.* It is not without an effort that those who possess this knowledge can communicate on such subjects with those who do not, and adapt their language and their illustrations to the necessities of such an intercourse. Propositions which to the one are almost identical are theorems of import and difficulty to the other; nor is their evidence presented in the same way to the mind of each."

The book is divided into four parts. The first comprises more than half the volume, and treats of spherical astronomy, astronomical instruments, and the bodies of our solar system; the second is devoted to the theory of planetary perturbations; the third is on sidereal astronomy; and in the last, which consists of but a single chapter, is a description of the several ways of keeping account of time, and of the different calendars.

The first few chapters are occupied with general ideas and elementary conceptions, terminology, and the like. Although these would naturally demand a place at the commencement of a popular work, and although they are elaborately given, yet we much doubt whether, as they stand, they will be of any service to beginners, unless perhaps these chapters may answer as a dictionary of technical terms. We say this on

account of the obscurity which they would present to the class of readers for whom the book is designed. Statements of simple propositions are made in technical language, and enveloped with a shroud of symbolic letters ; which, however clear to those accustomed to mathematical studies, are still in no wise attractive to the general reader. For instance, in the note to p. 55, speaking of the relative motion of two bodies, he says :—

“ If two bodies, A and B, be in motion independently of each other, the motion which B, seen from A, would appear to have if A were at rest, is the same with that which it would appear to have, A being in motion, if, in addition to its own motion, a motion equal to A's, and in the same direction, were communicated to it.”

This proposition seems to us indeed to require “ more thought for its clear apprehension than can perhaps be expected from a beginner,” more, indeed, than should be demanded of any one for the comprehension of so simple an idea. We believe that its meaning is merely, — that the real motion of a body (which is seen from another moving one) is the resultant of its apparent motion and that of the observer.

An anecdote is related upon page 20, in connection with the remarks on the “ dip of the horizon.” “ The history of aëronautic adventure ” is said to “ afford a curious illustration ” of this principle. A celebrated aëronaut, by the name of Sadler, descended in his balloon nearly to the surface of the sea, after sunset ; but, throwing out his ballast, suddenly rose again to a great height, and enjoyed “ the whole phenomenon of a western sunrise.” On descending again, he saw the sun set a second time. It is somewhat remarkable, that, in the course of his long Atlantic voyages, the author had never availed himself of a means of enjoying the same curious illustration, without any expenditure of gas. The masts and rigging of a ship furnish all the necessary apparatus, as every sailor, and almost every passenger, knows. It is by no means an unusual thing for an observer at the mast-head, or even at the crosstrees, to witness a sunrise, and then, descending rapidly, enjoy what the author would call the whole phenomenon of an eastern sunset.

A page or two farther on, the height of the atmosphere and of clouds is discussed. Sir John there states that “ it seems probable, from many indications, that the greatest height at

which visible clouds *ever exist* does not exceed ten miles ; at which height the density of the air is about an eighth part of what it is at the level of the sea." In a report to the French Academy, concerning the voyage of the frigate *Venus* in the Atlantic Ocean and South Sea, the commander, Admiral Du Petit Thouars, names as the maximum of the observed height of clouds, fourteen hundred metres.\* Kaemtz, however, in his *Treatise on Meteorology*, (i. 384,) states, that, on one occasion, a cloud was observed at the height of sixty-five hundred metres. This would give a maximum height of about four miles. We cannot, therefore, but cordially agree with Herschel that their greatest height probably never does exceed ten miles.

It is an interesting question at what height the specific gravity of the atmosphere would permit visible vapor to remain suspended. The density of air at the height of ten miles would correspond to a barometric pressure of one hundred and two millimetres, — about four inches.

The chapter upon astronomical instruments and observations will probably be useful to the beginner ; although, as we should expect, English instruments are described rather than continental ones, and the student is referred to Dr. Pearson's *Astronomy*. The standard of precision is a corresponding one ; — as when we read (on the same page) that "in good transit observations, an error of *two or three tenths of a second of time* in the moment of a star's culmination is the utmost which need be apprehended, exclusive of the error of the clock." Should this meet the eye of any of the German or Russian astronomers, they will be indeed amazed at the degree of precision which may be obtained !

We were somewhat surprised on reading the note at the bottom of the 103d page. Sir John Herschel there says :—

"By a peculiar and delicate manipulation and management of the setting, bisection, and reading off of the circle, aided by the use of a movable horizontal micrometric wire in the focus of the object-glass, it is found practicable to observe a slow-moving star (as the pole-star) *on one and the same night*, both by reflection and direct vision, sufficiently near to either culmination to give the horizontal point, without risking the change of refraction in twenty-four hours ; so that this source of error is completely eliminated."

---

\* A mile is a little more than 1609 metres.

Although the author seems to have been unaware of many of the refinements introduced into the continental observations, it is astonishing that he should not have known that it has been for many years the usage at Greenwich to observe not merely the slow-moving, but also the equatorial stars, at the same transit, both by reflection and by direct vision ; — the star being directly observed over one half the threads, and the telescope then quickly pointed to the reflected image, by means of an index-level previously set for this purpose.

The method of determining the zero point of an altitude circle, by reflection of the cross-threads of the telescope from the surface of mercury, is erroneously ascribed in page 108 to Benzenberg. Astronomy is indebted to Bohnenberger for this beautiful and accurate process, by which the telescope is "made its own collimator."

Still more strange is the manner in which the author entirely omits any mention of the name of Thomas Godfrey, of Philadelphia, "the inventor," as Dr. Franklin said long since, "of what is called Hadley's sextant." In the *American Magazine* for the months of July and August, 1758, and in the Notes to the first volume of Dr. Miller's "*Retrospect of the Eighteenth Century*," are a series of letters which prove, beyond the possibility of doubt, the independent invention of the instrument by Godfrey in 1730, prior to any publication by Hadley upon the subject. It is there shown how the knowledge of the invention could have reached Mr. Hadley ; and letters are published, written by both Logan and Godfrey to Dr. Halley, at that time Astronomer Royal of England. The date of these letters was 1732. Two years later, Mr. Logan publicly stated that he had transmitted his letter to Halley in May of that year. "I must own," said he, "that I could not but wonder that our good-will was never acknowledged. I did not then, nor do I now, assume any other merit than this in either of Godfrey's instruments. I only wished that the ingenious inventor himself might by some means be taken notice of, in a manner that might be of real advantage to him." All these circumstances of Mr. Logan's complaint were, as Dr. Miller stated in a foot-note, entirely omitted in the account of the matter which appeared in the *Philosophical Transactions*, "which strengthens the conjecture that justice has not been done to the original inventor." A claim has lately been brought forward for Sir Isaac Newton ; and Herschel speaks only of him and Hadley, making



not the slightest allusion to Godfrey. He says of the invention (note to p. 115), —

“ Newton communicated it to Dr. Halley, who suppressed it. The description of the instrument was found, after the death of Halley, among his papers in Newton's own handwriting, by his executor, who communicated the papers to the Royal Society, twenty-five years after Newton's death, and eleven after the publication of Hadley's invention, which might be, and probably was, independent of any knowledge of Newton's, though Hutton insinuates the contrary.”

Newton's death occurred in 1727. It is certain, therefore, as Dr. Patterson showed in his Address before the American Philosophical Society, at their centennial anniversary, that Godfrey could, at any rate, have had no knowledge of the paper. If the principle, that the publisher of an invention is to be regarded as the discoverer, be applied, as it should be, to this case, nothing can conflict with Godfrey's claim. Allowing all that is asserted concerning the manuscript among Halley's papers, it must have been a mere accident that it was ever found. A great number of interesting and valuable manuscripts of Newton still exist. Are they ever to be published? or will the narrow bigotry, which has thus far withheld them from the world, consign them to oblivion?

Notwithstanding this total neglect of Godfrey's claims, and of the authority of Franklin, Logan, and Patterson, we are yet gratified to perceive in the work indications of a more liberal spirit toward foreign science, than has usually characterized English popular works. Especially with regard to this country, the petty pseudo-nationality which has so long ignored the advances in science made by Americans, is decidedly decreasing. It is perhaps in a less degree evident in the work before us, than in any English astronomical treatise which has been published. The author, although more deeply imbued with the predilections and tastes of his own country than with the liberality which pervades all departments of learning in the home of his ancestors, is too high-minded and noble to allow himself intentionally to misrepresent any facts or theories. When, therefore, — as with regard to Peirce's article on the comet of 1843, to the claims of Godfrey to the invention of the sextant, to the elaborate researches made in America on the theory of Neptune, and many other subjects, — the labors of Ameri-

can astronomers have been passed over in silence, or met with sneers instead of arguments, it is perhaps unjust not to suppose that the author was either ignorant of them, or misunderstood their true bearing.

We have no particular desire to lay stress upon this. It is a very small matter. America, "thanks to God and to herself," needs no foreign praise, no adventitious renown. We are considering solely the merits of the "*Outlines of Astronomy*."

On page 172 we read that "it is a fact not a little interesting to Englishmen, and, combined with our insular station in that great highway of nations, the Atlantic, not a little explanatory of our commercial eminence, that London occupies nearly the centre of the terrestrial hemisphere"; and in a note the author states, that this central point falls almost exactly upon the town of Falmouth. Ritter called attention to the fact that the continent of Europe occupied this central position. To attempt to define it precisely is futile, and would show a misapprehension of the theories of physical geography, which are large generalizations, in which precise computation is not only uncalled for, but incongruous, and therefore inadmissible. The position of the centre of the terrestrial hemisphere depends of course upon the equator which we assume, and this may be considerably varied without any sacrifice of accuracy. Different individuals would unquestionably estimate it differently. We think, however, that any one who will set a twelve-inch globe in such a position as to bring the greatest possible amount of land above the wooden circle which represents the horizon, will find that the region between Rome and Palermo occupies the highest point. If, on the other hand, we take the view of centrality suggested by Professor Guyot, in his beautiful lectures on "*Earth and Man*," and select the point from which the three great continental formations diverge at mutual angles of about  $120^{\circ}$ , we come nearly upon Syria, the supposed cradle of the human race.

A strange assumption is to be found throughout the work. It is, that the heating power of the solar rays is independent of the atmosphere through which they are transmitted. According to this, the summits of mountains should at noon be the warmest places. While refraining from expressing any decided opinion of our own, we cannot but consider it strange that Sir John Herschel should express his own views

so dogmatically upon a question where the scientific world are divided, even were his own opinions those of the majority. On page 235 he enters into an argument to prove that the temperature of the sun's surface is higher "than any artificial heat produced in our furnaces, or by chemical or galvanic processes." In favor of this hypothesis he adduces three distinct arguments: "1st. From the law of decrease of radiant heat and light, which, being inversely as the squares of the distances, it follows that the heat received on a given area exposed at the distance of the earth, and on an equal area at the visible surface of the sun, must be in the proportion of the area of the sky occupied by the sun's apparent disc to the whole hemisphere, or as 1 to about 300000. A far less intensity of solar radiation, collected in the focus of a burning-glass, suffices to dissipate gold and platina in vapor. 2dly. From the facility with which the calorific rays of the sun traverse glass, a property which is found to belong to the heat of artificial fires in the direct proportion of their intensity. 3dly. From the fact that the most vivid flames disappear, and the most intensely ignited solids appear only as black spots on the disc of the sun, when held between it and the eye. From the last remark it follows, that the body of the sun, however dark it may appear when seen through its spots, *may*, nevertheless, be in a state of most intense ignition. It does not, however, follow of necessity that it *must* be so. The contrary is, at least, physically possible."

Of these reasons, we will only say that the first and second rest entirely upon the assumption above referred to, and that the third proves only the sun's intense splendor, not its intense heat.

The flame-like protuberances on the eclipsed disc which accompanied the solar eclipse of July, 1842, and which have been since so often described and commented upon, the author considers clearly proved to have been cloudy masses in the solar atmosphere (p. 235); and the somewhat similar phenomenon of patches of red light on the edge of the moon's disc, which have been so often observed in lunar eclipses, is ingeniously explained by supposing the rays of the sun, refracted round the earth, to be partially transmitted and partially intercepted by terrestrial clouds, and red light to be thus thrown into the umbra.

There is a widely disseminated notion that the author's

father, the illustrious William Herschel, believed in the dependence of meteorological phenomena, especially the state of the weather, upon the phases of the moon. The most careful study of barometric and thermometric records has uniformly failed to indicate any connection between these so widely different phenomena, and no theory has pointed out any reason for such connection; yet the belief in this dependence of the weather upon the moon is still deeply rooted in the minds of many, and defended by citing the great name of Sir William Herschel. Sir John, at last, by a letter published in Schumacher's *Astronomical Journal*, openly denied that either his father or himself had entertained such views, or pretended to be able to predict, by any length of time, the state of the weather. In the work before us, he again states his belief that there is no evidence of any influence of the moon upon the weather, excepting the tendency of clouds to disappear under the full moon, — a tendency which he has independently observed, but to which Humboldt alluded in his personal narrative as a fact known to the sailors of Spanish America.

After a full account of the two most conspicuous celestial bodies, the sun and moon, of the theory of eclipses and the law of gravitation, the author proceeds to the consideration of the other members of our solar system, and devotes the three remaining chapters of the first part of his book to the planets, satellites, and comets. We have some strictures to make upon these chapters, although we must acknowledge not having studied them enough to appreciate their merit; — perhaps in consequence of the impressions derived from the first perusal.

The small planets, belonging to the extensive and remarkable group between Mars and Jupiter, have, by the common consent of astronomers, received the name of *asteroids*. This term was originally proposed by the elder Herschel, and though perhaps open to criticism, has been so universally adopted, that it must now be regarded as their legitimate name. The word *asteroid* is fortunately in the index, but is to be found, we believe, in no other part of the book, excepting as a definition on page 294. The name *ultra-zodiacal planets* has been substituted, and, with a single exception, used throughout the volume. The degree of correctness of this term may be inferred from the fact, that, out of the ten planets known to belong to this group, there are



only four which ever pass the limits of the zodiac, the other six being as strictly confined within these limits as any of the large planets. On page 426, the asteroids are called *extra-tropical planets*. We are at a loss to know what this means. The only interpretation which we can give to the word *extra-tropical* is "outside the tropics"; but we cannot believe that so experienced an observer as Sir John Herschel would deny that every planet comes, nearly once a year, within this category.

While speaking of the "ultra-zodiacal" or "extra-tropical" group, the author alludes to the empirical formula which has been called "Bode's law." In the "Treatise on Astronomy," the author stated his conviction that "the circumstances mentioned lead to a strong belief that it is something beyond a mere accidental coincidence, and belongs to the essential structure of the system." In the present edition, the sentence is retained, with the exception that the verbs have been changed from the present to the imperfect tense.

In the note to the new work, he says : —

"The empirical law itself, as we have above stated it, is ascribed by Voiron, not to Bode, (who would appear, however, at all events, to have first drawn attention to this interpretation of its interruption,) but to Professor Titius, of Wittemberg. (Voiron, Supplement to Bailly.)"

Bode was neither the first to draw attention to the empirical law, nor to its interruption; and had the author looked a little farther, he would have found that Voiron, who merely copied the reference to Titius, was not the only one who had called attention to his claim. Lalande mentions, in the appendix to his Bibliography, (p. 545,) that Titius, in the notes to his translation \* of Bonnet's "*Contemplation de la Nature*," published in 1772, remarked that the distances of the planetary orbits from the orbit of Mercury might be represented by the multiples of 3, but that a term of the series was wanting between Mars and Jupiter, where an unknown planet might perhaps exist, and thus fill the gap concerning which Kepler had speculated so much.

Biot, too, in his series of articles in the "*Journal des*

---

\* See edition of 1783, p. 14, where, however, a point is erroneously printed throughout instead of the sign of addition.

*Savants*, 1846," not only alluded to Titius in this connection, (as did also Gauss in the "*Monatl. Correspondenz*," 1802,) but gave the reference to Lalande. Bode first mentioned it in his "*Einleitung zur Kenntniss des gestirnten Himmels*," referring, however, to two articles by Wurm, in the Berlin Astronomical Almanac for 1790 and 1791. In these two papers, Wurm had given the formula, apparently without knowing that it had been previously published by Titius, and in a general algebraical form, which applied also to the distances of satellites from their primaries.\* In communicating this formula, together with several other equally curious ones, Wurm had the merit of calling especial attention to the fact that the harmony of the progression was broken by Mercury. The proposition was, however, stated in such a form as to be approximately true, by reckoning the distances, not from the sun, but from the orbit of Mercury. Wurm did not pretend to believe the progression to be anything more than a curious coincidence, and earnestly requested that too much weight might not be attributed to it. He called the idea an astronomical fantasy, (*astronomische Schwärmerei*), and alluded to the analogy which Kepler had discovered between the five regular solids and the five planetary intervals. This analogy, which was subsequently destroyed by the discovery of Uranus, represented in fact all the planetary distances quite as well as the formula of which we now speak. Kepler announced it, in triumphant language, in his "*Mysterium Cosmographicum*," a work written expressly to develop this theory:—

"Quid mundus, quæ causa Deo, ratioque creandi,  
Unde Deo numeri, quæ tantæ regula moli,  
Quid faciat sex circuitus, quo quælibet orbe,  
Intervalla cadant, cur tanto Jupiter et Mars,  
Orbitus haud primis, interstinguantur hiatu:  
Hic te Pythagoras docet omnia quinque figuris.  
Scilicet exemplo docuit, nos posse renasci,  
Bis mille erratis, dum fit Copernicus, annis,  
Hoc, melior Mundi speculator, nominis. At tu  
Glandibus inventas noli postponere fruges."

We are, then, only warranted in considering the formula of Titius, Wurm, or Bode, as the reader may please to call

---

\* Prof. Challis, of Cambridge, Eng., published an interesting paper in the Transactions of the Philosophical Society of that University, (vol. iii. p. 171,) to show that "Bode's law" finds application in the systems of satellites as well as in the system of primary planets. He was evidently unaware of this article by Wurm.

it, as a neat representation of the planetary distances, valuable for the mnemonic aid which it affords. The illustrious Gauss has repeatedly protested against its being termed a law, inasmuch as it is, at the best, but approximate, and in no respect possessing the precision which characterizes Nature's laws. The discovery of Neptune at the distance 11 beyond the orbit of Uranus, while the formula would make this distance 19, has, we conceive, shaken the faith of the firmest adherent. While for this and many other reasons we differ decidedly from the author in his views regarding the discovery of Neptune, we cannot but admire the exquisite applicability of his quotation from Schiller's epigram on Columbus, and abstain from saying anything which could mar the beauty of the thought : —

“ Mit dem Genius steht die Natur in ewigem Bunde,  
Was der Eine verspricht, leistet die Andre gewiss.”

Nature is bound in a never-ceasing alliance with genius,  
That which is promised by one, ever the other provides.

In consequence of the confusion which arose in the nomenclature of the satellites of Saturn, from the circumstance that the order of their discovery was not that of their distances, the author proposed, some time since, a mythological nomenclature, analogous to that of the planets. The unnecessary multiplication of empirical names should unquestionably be avoided ; but in this case the new nomenclature, though unwieldy, would perhaps tend to perspicuity, and it seems, therefore, to have been adopted by Messrs. Bond and Lassell, each of whom, after his independent detection of an eighth satellite, gave to the new body the name *Hyperion*. This is not mentioned in the text of the work before us, which was probably printed at the time. The author, desirous of facilitating the remembrance of the names which he had proposed, suggests (in the note to p. 337) the following pentameters as affording an easy artificial memory, the series commencing with the most distant satellite : —

“ Iapetus, Titan, Rhea, Dione, Tethys [pron. Téthys]  
Enceladus, Mimas ——— ”

The name selected for the new satellite, however appropriate it may be, does not seem inclined to lend itself to verse, nor, by its interpolation, to improve the rhythm. But after placing it in its proper position in the line, the names may be read into a kind of anti-Virgilian hexameter, which

may be of service to those who desire to remember them, and are accustomed to rely upon mnemonic aid : —

Iapetus, Hyperion, Titan, Rhea, Dione,  
Tethys, Enceladusque, Mimas, — Titanides octo.

Although availing ourselves of the “poetic license” to its full extent, we are thus enabled to give the correct quantity to the first syllables of Tethys and Mimas.

We are told on page 322 that Neptune is attended “very probably by two satellites, though the existence of the second can hardly yet be considered as quite demonstrated.”

In the chapter upon comets, a great number of the errors which existed in the former edition have been corrected. But the greater part of the chapter consists of new matter. We shall not stop to criticize the statement that some comets move in hyperbolas, although Professor Peirce has shown the extreme improbability of this. No one will deny the *possibility* that an intense perturbation by one of the large planets might, under peculiar circumstances, throw a comet into a hyperbolic orbit ; so, too, the centre of gravity of the solar system might be in a direction sufficiently different from that of the sun to cause an elliptic orbit to *appear* hyperbolic ; but the eccentricity of none of the orbits, to which Sir John Herschel refers, can be said to differ sufficiently from unity to put their hyperbolism beyond question.

A highly interesting account of Halley's and of Biela's comet is given, in the course of which the author states his views concerning the formation of comets' tails. While we admire the clearness with which these views are expressed, we would take the same ground as we took before with regard to the solar heat, — that while different astronomers are so far from agreeing in their opinions, this want of unanimity ought to be alluded to in an elementary work. The near approach of Biela's comet to the earth's orbit is mentioned, and the remark made, that had the earth, “at the time of the comet's passage in 1832, been a month in advance of its actual place, it would have passed through the comet, — a singular rencontre, perhaps not unattended with danger.”\*

In the account of the periodicity of Faye's comet, no allusion whatever is made to Professor Goldschmidt, who first discovered that it moved in an ellipse of short period.

Respecting the periodic comet discovered by Peters in 1846, the author says, that elliptic elements have been com-

---

\* Qu. To the earth, or to the comet ?



puted by D'Arrest, "which go to assign it a place among the comets of short period, viz. 5804.3, days, or very nearly 16 years. The eccentricity of the orbit is 0.75672, its semi-axis 6.32066, and the inclination of its plane to that of the ecliptic  $31^{\circ} 2' 14''$ ." It is most true, that D'Arrest computed these elements; but Sir John Herschel does not seem to have been aware that Dr. Peters afterwards published, in 1847, — more than eighteen months before the publication of the "Outlines of Astronomy," — a labored and classic work upon this comet, — the "*Memoria sopra la Nuova Cometa Periodica di tredici anni*," — in which, after a thorough discussion of the whole series of observations from June 26th to July 21st, he deduces a final orbit. The resulting period is about  $12\frac{17}{20}$  years, or less than 4700 days. The eccentricity of the orbit is 0.72134, its semi-axis (major) 5.48558, and the inclination of its plane to the ecliptic  $30^{\circ} 24' 24''$ . Peters has still farther shown that the period cannot be so long as fourteen years.

The great comet of 1843 is discussed at length, but the author does not appear to have seen Peirce's important article in the American Almanac for 1844, which is by far the most thorough research concerning that comet ever published. Nor is any mention made of the remarkable observation on the 27th February, the day of the perihelion passage, by Captain Ray, and given to the public by Hon. William Mitchell, of Nantucket, although this is the observation which has furnished the chief difficulty to computers; nor yet a word said of the extremely valuable observations, made on the 28th, by Mr. Bowring, in Chihuahua, where the comet was visible from nine o'clock in the morning until sunset. These observations were published both in the *Comptes Rendus* of the French Academy, and in Schumacher's Journal. And what is very strange, while we read on page 370 that "there seem good grounds for believing that its whole course cannot be reconciled with a parabolic orbit, and that it really describes an ellipse," yet not one of the five orbits given as "those which seem entitled to most confidence" is an ellipse. Herschel has, moreover, given three out of these five orbits erroneously. The first is a hyperbola, computed as an experiment by Encke, before the series of observations was complete, — and an orbit to which the Prussian Astronomer Royal would attach but little weight, as it deviates from Clarke's observation of Feb. 28th by nearly seven minutes.

Herschel has stated the Greenwich time of the perihelion passage in this orbit to be, Feb. 27.45096. The fraction should, according to Encke, be .46056. In Plantamour's elements, he has given the inclination as  $35^{\circ} 8' 56''$ ; it should be  $35^{\circ} 45' 39''$ . In the third orbit, the time of perihelion is put down, Feb. 27.39638, and the longitude of the node,  $1^{\circ} 48' 3''$ ; these numbers should be 27.42700 and  $1^{\circ} 48' 43''$ .

But we are throwing away our time and the space allowed us, by dwelling upon errors of minor importance. On the next page we read that the heat to which the comet was subjected surpassed, in the proportion of  $24\frac{1}{2}$  to 1, that in the focus of a certain great lens, which melted agate and rock crystal.

After mentioning the marked similarity of the orbit to that of the comet of 1668, whose identity with this one may be considered as almost demonstrated, Herschel proceeds to state the arguments in favor of its identity with that of 1689, and its consequent period of  $21\frac{1}{3}$  years. Walker first suggested this period, but no allusion is made to him. Peirce recalculated the elements of the latter comet and found an orbit differing much from Pingré's, and sufficiently similar to that of the present comet to offer no obstacle to the hypothesis. He rejected the theory, however, because he found it incapable of representing the observations. Herschel, on the other hand, does not look at the question from this point of view, but says (p. 372), —

"It is worth remarking, that this period, calculated backwards from 1843.156 will bring us upon a series of years remarkable for the appearance of great comets, many of which, as well as the imperfect descriptions we have of their appearance and situation in the heavens, offer at least no obvious contradiction to the supposition of their identity with this. Besides those already mentioned as indicated by the period of 175 years, we may specify as probable or possible intermediate returns, those of the comets of 1733?, 1689 above mentioned, 1559?, 1537, 1515, 1471, 1426, 1405-6, 1383, 1361, 1340, 1296, 1274, 1230, 1208, 1098, 1056, 1034, 1012, 990?, 925?, 858??, 684, 552, 530, 421, 245 or 247, 180, 158. Should this view of the subject be the true one, we may expect its return about the end of 1864 or beginning of 1865, in which event it will be observable in the Southern Hemisphere, both before and after its perihelion passage."

It would hardly be difficult, we may be permitted to say, to furnish for any theory a list of corresponding years, in which somebody has reported a comet. The catalogue of

comets, real or imagined, is so large, that, in many cases, some record may be found of sixty or seventy during the lapse of a century. It cannot, of course, be inferred that so many have actually appeared ; for, owing to mistakes of date, and to the assumption that every brilliant meteor was a comet, the true number has been unquestionably much exaggerated. Whenever a monarch died, or any calamity occurred, whether a comet had been seen or not, it was yet inferred that one must have been in the heavens ; inasmuch as celestial portents always preceded such occurrences, and the historian or the biographer of royalty seldom omitted to record the fiery swords in the heavens. These become, in course of time, comets. The translation and publication, by Goubil, Guignes, and latterly by Edouard Biot, of the Chinese astronomical annals, has furnished a large addition to the catalogues previously existing, and we are thus enabled to find, within a year of almost any given date, some recorded appearance.

When nothing is said concerning a comet excepting that it was seen, we are of course unable to adduce any argument for or against the hypothesis of its identity with another one ; but fortunately, there is, in most cases, some little remark appended, containing either a rough intimation of the part of the heavens where it appeared, or of the time at which it was visible. It is so with regard to the most of those cited above.

The perihelion distance of the comet of 1843 is, as the author has already said, smaller than that of any other comet which has been recorded. The angle between node and perihelion is about  $82^{\circ}$ , and it is therefore evident that only an extremely small part of the orbit can be situated north of the ecliptic, — a part which the comet would require about two hours to traverse. No comet, therefore, which has been observed to be in north latitude, except on the day of its perihelion, can be for a moment presumed to be identical with this one. From December to July, it can never have been seen in the signs between the middle of Cancer and Sagittarius, nor in the other months between Capricorn and Gemini. This is clear to any one who will reflect for a moment, or draw the roughest diagram. And, as the axis of the orbit is nearly perpendicular to the line of nodes, and the orbit very eccentric, the comet is invisible to all observers north of the equator, except for a very short time, directly before and after the perihelion passage.

Let us now compare the comets of the author's list with the comet of 1843, using for reference the *Cometography* of Pingré, from which, as Sir John Herschel states, "all these recorded appearances are taken." We will consider them separately.

1733. Of this one, Herschel himself says that it "seems too early in the year."

† 1559. This year two comets are mentioned, — the one was seen in the east for three or four weeks in May and June, which never could have been true for the comet of 1843; of the other we have only the record, "Comet in November."

1537. "Comet in January," says Pingré, "in Pisces, and another in May in Taurus. These are manifestly the two following ones," — those of 1538 and 1539. Be this as it may, neither can agree with the supposition of identity, for the first was seen in  $17^{\circ}$ , the second in  $12^{\circ}$ , north latitude.

1515. A comet is said to have announced the death of Ferdinand the Catholic, who died in 1516, the year given by Pingré, and not in 1515, as Herschel asserts.

1471. The first one mentioned this year was seen *in Virgo in the month of March*. The second was the comet known as that of 1472. It first appeared in 1471, and *lasted many months*. Its orbit, moreover, has been calculated by Halley and Langier, and found totally different from that of the comet of 1843.

† 1426. "On the 9th of June," says Pingré, "a comet was seen above the church of the Frères-mineurs; it extended its rays towards the great square of the town (Liege); it lasted a week." As we have no means of knowing the position of the observer, we can say nothing on the subject, and leave to the author all the support for his theory which he can deduce from the comet of 1426.

† 1405–6. No comet is recorded in 1405. "In the first half of 1406, a comet was seen in the west."

1383. The following is Pingré's account: — "In 1383, the tomb of St. Dominique was opened, and, as long as it remained open, a large and very brilliant star, from which three tails diverged, *remained immovably fixed* above the church of this saint. I do not consider this phenomenon to have been a comet."

1361. Pingré says that the mention of a comet in this year was manifestly through mistake, and that the first one of



1362 was intended. This was too far north, having been near  $\lambda$  Pegasi. It was there, moreover, *in the month of March*, and visible *for two months*. The second comet of 1362 was so far north that it did not set. Its rays are said to have been a foot long.

1340. "Evidently a southern comet and a very probable appearance." — *Herschel*. "Seen *at the end of Virgo or beginning of Libra*, toward the last of March." — *Pingré*.

1296. "A comet, *visible for a long time* in the heavens, announced future events, and especially the death of the Emperor Adolphus, *who died in 1298*."

† 1274. "Probably a return of that of 1661."

† 1230. No particulars known. "Perhaps a return of Halley's comet." — *Pingré* and *Herschel*.

The comet of 1231 was seen *in Scorpio* in March, and had at one time a north latitude of  $60^\circ$ .

1208. *Pingré* believes this to have been the planet Venus.

† 1098. "The very night of the taking of Antioch, (June 3,) the comet, which is accustomed to announce the revolution of empires, shone out among the stars of the sky, and spread far the brilliancy of its rays. A redness of fire was also seen between the north and east." Nothing more is known of it.

1056. This comet was so far to the northward as to be "among the stars which never set."

† 1034. With regard to this comet we know nothing which would make the supposition of identity preposterous.

1012. Was seen *for three months*.

† 990. "'Comète fort épouvantable' some year between 989 and 998." — *Herschel*. *Pingré* mentions *nine* within this period. Seven of them could not possibly have been identical with the comet of 1843. Of the other two nothing is known, but that they are said to have appeared; this, however, upon very slight authority.

925. This one was seen in the autumn after sunset, which sets the hypothesis of identity at rest.

858. At the death of Pope Benedict III., in April, a comet was seen in the east, with its tail toward the west. That of 1843 could not have been in this position.

684. Three comets are mentioned this year. "Dates begin to be obscure," says the author! It is nevertheless impossible for either of the three to be brought into conformity with his hypothesis, for the first was seen *in September*, to-

*wards the west*, the second between Christmas and Epiphany, *near the Pleiades*, and the third was visible *for three months*.

† 552. "Torches were seen in heaven, and a comet appeared, the year before the death of Theodebald."—*Pingré*.

530–531. The first was seen *for twenty days* in the west, with *its tail towards the zenith*. The second went from Arcturus to the Great Bear, far to the north.

† 421. Kao-tsou ascended the throne of China in 420 or 421. "In the fourth moon of the first year of his reign a comet appeared." "In Europe, an admirable sign was seen in the heavens. Could it have been a comet?"—*Pingré*.

† 245 or 247. For the first of these the hypothesis is not impossible. The second was seen *for 156 days*.

180. This one was *near Sirius*, in November.

158. "Janssen Twisk, in his Treatise on Comets, mentions one, *qui a dû paraître cette année!*"—*Pingré*.

We have thus reviewed the whole list, excepting the comet of 1689, the similarity of whose true elements was shown at the time by Professor Peirce's investigations, which have furnished Herschel with his arguments as respects this comet. We see, that, of twenty-eight recorded comets, which are specified by Sir John Herschel "as probable or possible intermediate returns," there are seventeen which could not possibly, under any supposition, be made to accord with his theory. Of the eleven which remain, *Pingré* doubts the existence of *four*, *two* correspond with probable appearances of other periodical comets, and of *three* others nothing whatever is known.

Had so loose and unwarranted assertions appeared in any elementary work made by a professed compiler, they would deserve and receive the severest reprehension. In a work like the one before us, and coming from such an author, they cannot fail to excite deep regret,—and the deeper, the greater the author's reputation, and the injury which they are therefore likely to do. Why was the concluding sentence of this chapter in the "Treatise on Astronomy" omitted in the present edition?

In passing to the criticism of the other divisions of the work, we will state that the inaccuracies to which we have alluded have not been detected by any search instituted with this object, but are those which struck our attention upon the first cursory perusal. The work abounds also in mistakes of carelessness, to which we have not thought it

necessary to allude, because they are not particularly dangerous, since the slightest reference to authorities would rectify them. Thus, for instance, the author says (p. 351) that Halley's comet in 1835 was "observed at Pulkowa up to the very day of its perihelion passage." He meant unquestionably Dorpat, since the Pulkowa Observatory was not established till 1839. On page 356, reference is made to Schumacher's Catalogue of Comets. The celebrated catalogue by Olbers is intended, which was published in the collection of astronomical papers edited by Professor Schumacher. So, too, we find (p. 159) that "the differences of longitude between the *observatories of New York, Washington, and Philadelphia*, have been very recently determined [by electro-magnetic telegraph] by the astronomers at those observatories."

The second part of the book treats, as has been already said, of the lunar and planetary perturbations. It is this part of the work to which Herschel has devoted the most attention in preparing the "Outlines." But, as he justly remarked in the Preface, this subject cannot be made elementary. The author has succeeded, better than would perhaps have been supposed, in expressing a number of important theorems in ordinary language, and in giving a general sketch of the subject without using the phraseology of the calculus. But we much doubt whether his mode of presenting the subject will prove attractive to any class of students. We think that by far the majority of readers will pass over these chapters; that those who possess sufficient mathematical taste to relish the account here given will need no aid of the kind in order to comprehend the analytical treatment of the subject; and that mathematicians who are already familiar with the theory of perturbations will find Herschel's development heavy and yet diffuse. Still we are ready to acknowledge that the difficulty lies rather in the nature of the problem than in the author.

The theory of Neptune is the only part of which we intend to speak, and we desire the more earnestly to speak of this, not so much on account of our conviction of the untenable nature of the ground here taken, and of the flaws in the reasoning, — flaws none the less perceptible from the labor bestowed on the endeavour to conceal them, — as on account of the authority which the author's name carries with it, Credence would unquestionably be given to his statements,

were they not boldly challenged and clearly refuted. Men have even been found in this community ready to consider a slur in the "*Outlines of Astronomy*" a sufficient offset to the authority of America's most illustrious geometer.

It almost seems as if the very name Neptune were, throughout the book, under the ban of some evil genius; for seldom indeed does it occur, unaccompanied by an erroneous statement. The first place in which it is to be found, in this division of the work, is on page 427, where it is stated that "forty-one revolutions of Neptune are nearly equal to eighty-one of Uranus, giving rise to an inequality, having 6805 years for its period." The author probably obtained these numbers by using the incorrect elements of Uranus which he has given in his appendix; — elements, once a fair approximation, but utterly inadequate to furnish data of proper accuracy, since the careful determination of the orbit of Uranus by Le Verrier. Successive approximations to the ratio of the two periods are  $\frac{24}{47}$ ,  $\frac{25}{48}$ , and  $\frac{49}{98}$ , the last being correct to the fifth decimal place. The period of the inequality cannot differ much from 4051.26 years.

The circumstances which preceded and accompanied the discovery of Neptune are known to the public. So, too, is the discussion which arose between the partisans of the two candidates, as well as the subsequent and still more remarkable discovery of Professor Peirce, that the problem, as it had presented itself to Messrs. Le Verrier and Adams, admitted of two solutions, of which these geometers, relying on "Bode's law," selected the wrong one. All this is matter of history, — we have only to do with the assertions in Herschel's book. Sir John denies the fact that the solution of Le Verrier and Adams is not the correct one, and endeavours to show that the uncertainty of the calculations was so great that Neptune may be considered as coming within Adams's theory. The course which he has taken to prove this is such, that those who assent to his views can only allow to Adams the merit of having approximately found the period of Uranus's greatest perturbation, and assumed that it was at that time in conjunction with the disturbing planet. We deliberately assert that the position which Herschel has taken would, when legitimately carried out, deprive Mr. Adams of any other claim to having made a brilliant investigation, than that to which a man would be fairly entitled, who, after computing the epochs of Uranus's greatest variation



from theory, should have inferred the position of Neptune from a graphical approximation. This planet would, if we use Herschel's diagram, (Plate A, fig. 4,) be in conjunction with Uranus at the time when, in the curve representing the residual differences between observation and computation, the great wave should cut the "medial line." On the other hand, the merit which American astronomers accord to Le Verrier and to Adams is scarcely, if at all, inferior to that which would have been attributed to these geometers had Neptune been the planet of their theory.

We take the liberty to quote a sentence from Sir John Herschel's "*Results of Astronomical Observations made at the Cape of Good Hope*," published in 1847. The author is speaking of a double star, ( $\gamma$  Virginis,) whose period he had formerly computed as 628.9 years, but has since concluded to be but 182.1. He shows that the observations, on which his former orbit was founded, may be represented by either of the two ; and adds, —

"This is not the first, by many instances in the history of scientific progress, where, of two possible courses, each at the moment equally plausible, the wrong has been chosen." — p. 294, §191.

Mr. Adams seems indeed to have, in Sir John Herschel, a most maladroit champion. The first assertion which the author makes, in approaching the history of the investigations which led to the discovery of Neptune, is (p. 507), "that up to the year 1804, it might have been safely asserted that positively no ground whatever existed for suspecting any disturbing influence." Neptune had, it is true, not been in conjunction with Uranus since about 1651, and the earliest observation of the latter which we possess was made in 1690 ; but, according to Mr. Adams's theory, the two planets would have been in conjunction just at the time of that observation. (See also page 517.)

Still worse is the remark, on the same page, that "the idea of setting out from the observed anomalous deviations, and employing them as data to ascertain the distance and situation of the unknown body, appears to have occurred only to two mathematicians, Mr. Adams in England, and M. Le Verrier in France, with sufficient distinctness and hopefulness of success to induce them to attempt its solution." In the *London Athenæum* for October 3d, 1846, will be found a

letter from Sir John Herschel to the editor, dated October 1st, the day after the news of the discovery of Neptune at Berlin had reached him. We quote from this letter :

“On the 12th July, 1842, the late illustrious astronomer Bessel honored me with a visit at my present residence. On the evening of that day, conversing on the great work of the planetary reductions, undertaken by the Astronomer Royal, — then in progress and since published, — M. Bessel remarked, that the motions of Uranus, as he had satisfied himself by careful examination of the recorded observations, could not be accounted for by the perturbations of the known planets ; and that the deviations far exceeded any possible limits of error of observation. In reply to the question, Whether the deviations in question might not be due to the action of an unknown planet, he said that he considered it highly probable that such was the case, — being systematic, and such as might be produced by an exterior planet. I then inquired whether he had attempted, from the indications afforded by these perturbations, to discover the position of the unknown body, — in order that ‘a hue and cry’ might be raised for it. From his reply, the words of which I do not call to mind, I collected that he had not then gone into that inquiry ; but proposed to do so, having now completed certain works which had occupied too much of his time. And, accordingly, in a letter which I received from him, after his return to Königsberg, dated November 14, 1842, he says, ‘In reference to our conversation at Collingwood, I *announce* to you (*melde ich Ihnen*) that Uranus is not forgotten.’ ”

Bessel spoke of his investigations in a public lecture delivered in Königsberg, February 28th, 1840, and published in 1847 ; but an attack of severe illness, which terminated in death, prevented him from carrying out his computations.

On page 510, stress is laid upon the fact that Mr. Adams stated that the errors since 1840 might be much diminished by taking a smaller semi-axis, “and that a mean distance of 33.3 would probably satisfy all the phenomena very nearly.” This hasty conclusion was obtained by an application of the “rule of three” to the discrepancies of the elements since 1840, and we doubt whether Mr. Adams will be grateful to the author for dwelling upon it. Apart from the fact, that this distinguished mathematician availed himself of more refined methods for determining the orbit, it is now known that an impassable barrier to inferences of this kind exists at the mean distance of 35.3. An exceedingly important change in the character of the perturbations takes place at

this point, — a change so great, that investigations made with regard to the region on one side cannot be extended to the other. The discordances would be increased, not diminished, by a decrease of the mean distance from 36 to 35.

Continuing the strange course, which he has hitherto pursued with regard to the claims of Messrs. Le Verrier and Adams, Herschel urges the plea, that the hypothetical elements not only place the planet, at the time of its discovery, in a *direction* extremely near that of Neptune, but also at a *distance* “very much more approximately correct, than the mean distances of the respective orbits.” This is true, Neptune having been at his aphelion nearly at the time when the theoretical planet would have been in perihelion, — the enormous eccentricity attributed to the orbit of the latter producing a great influence in decreasing the perihelion distance. But we can scarcely consider this as strong ground in favor of Herschel’s position. The two mathematicians, who solved the “inverse problem of the perturbations of Uranus,” did not profess to solve it for any particular epoch, but attempted to find the true orbit and mass of the disturbing planet; the elements, when known, would enable us to assign its direction and distance at any moment. Herschel has given a table of comparison, which extends, however, over but few years on each side of the conjunction. The following one covers more ground, extending through one revolution : —

Year.	True Longitudes of			True Distances of		
	Neptune.	Le Verrier's planet.	Adams's planet.	Neptune.	Le Verrier's planet.	Adams's planet.
1680	320.0	50.7	67.8	30.01	38.25	39.93
1700	4.4	79.2	94.5	29.84	39.63	41.30
1720	49.1	106.5	119.8	29.77	40.04	41.74
1740	93.8	134.0	145.5	29.86	39.40	41.09
1760	138.1	163.0	172.6	30.04	37.84	39.46
1780	181.8	195.1	202.7	30.22	35.68	37.15
1800	225.9	231.4	236.8	30.30	33.57	34.74
1820	268.5	270.9	275.2	30.23	32.64	33.06
1840	312.0	312.0	315.9	30.02	32.63	32.91
1860	356.4	351.0	355.0	29.87	34.26	34.37
1880	41.1	25.8	29.9	29.77	36.48	36.73

In the note to page 517, the assertion of Professor Peirce, that the coincidence in *direction* between Neptune and the planet of Le Verrier’s theory was the result of a “happy accident,” is said “to be founded on a total misconception of the nature of the problem.” If we understand the matter at all, Professor Peirce took the problem, as Le Verrier and

Adams propounded it, without making any assumption as to its nature. But this note is unworthy to be dwelt on.

The chapter closes with a statement so diametrically opposed to the truth, that we have hesitated considerably before deciding to mention it. But though it carries the evident marks of its untruth on its very face, yet these might pass unnoticed by persons not versed in astronomy. We therefore allude to it, premising that the formulas and numerical data alluded to were not computed by Mr. Walker, as the author states, but by Professor Peirce. This geometer gave the following table of comparison between the perturbations of the longitude of Uranus, which would be produced by Adams's hypothetical planet, and those which are really produced by Neptune :—

Action upon the longitude of Uranus by			Action upon the longitude of Uranus by		
Date.	Adams's planet.	Neptune.	Date.	Adams's planet.	Neptune.
1840	— 118"	— 3377"	1797	+ 163"	— 1816"
1835	— 96	— 3235	1792	+ 181	— 1967
1829	— 70	— 2964	1787	+ 178	— 2210
1824	— 44	— 2684	1782	+ 150	— 2504
1819	— 13	— 2393	1769	+ 21	— 3225
1813	+ 35	— 2072	1756	— 105	— 3431
1808	+ 83	— 1881	1715	+ 191	— 1845
1803	+ 123	— 1781			

This enormous difference is met by Herschel with the greatest composure. He says, — "This is easily explained. Mr. Adams's perturbations are deviations from Bouvard's orbit of Uranus as it stood immediately previous to the late conjunction. Mr. Walker's are the deviations from a mean or undisturbed orbit, freed from the influence of the long inequality resulting from the near commensurability of the motions."

We are at a loss what to say of this extremely cool assertion, excepting that it is without the least shadow of foundation. The table has no reference to any "deviations," nor to any particular orbit of Uranus, but to the perturbative influence exerted upon Uranus by the real and by the hypothetical planet ; and the comparison, as given in the table, is perfectly legitimate.

We have consumed the space allotted us in the consideration of the first two parts, which form about three quarters of the work ; and are thus debarred from considering at present the remainder of the volume. This is entirely in keeping with the part which we have reviewed, — containing many errors and omissions.



Believing that the "Outlines of Astronomy," supported as they are by the name of Herschel, would be considered as authority, should public attention not be directed to the inaccuracies and incompleteness of the work, we have deemed it our duty to do this. Too much weight is often given, in our country, to a great foreign name; and we are well aware that criticisms upon a Herschel will not be received with favor, or even with lenity. The duty, therefore, appears to us so much the more imperative. But while endeavouring to expose the errors which pervade the volume, we have striven to speak of the distinguished author with the respect and deference to which his eminent services to science, and his world-wide reputation, entitle him. If the student be on his guard against implicit reliance upon the correctness of the book, he may unquestionably derive from it essential benefit. It is a work of ability, replete with information, and parts of it are well calculated to excite the enthusiasm of those who possess a taste for the study of Nature in her grandest phases. The errors, numerous as we have seen them to be, are ye generally the consequence rather of superficial investigation than of anything worse. The only exception which we are disposed to make is in the account of Neptune; and we can make allowances for peculiar sensitiveness in Sir John Herschel on this subject. It would perhaps be expecting more than human nature would warrant, were it otherwise. Still, the community has a right, in a didactic work, to demand a narration of facts, rather than an *ex parte* statement. This—however difficult in cases where the narrator has himself played a part—we should yet have expected from the author of the beautiful paragraph in the Introduction to the present work, in which he says that the devotee of science "must strengthen himself by something of an effort, and resolve for the unprejudiced admission of any conclusion, which shall appear to be supported by careful observation and logical argument, even should it prove of a nature adverse to notions he may have previously formed for himself, or taken up, without examination, on the credit of others. Such an effort is the first movement of approach towards that state of mental purity which alone can fit us for a full and steady perception of moral beauty, as well as physical adaptation. It is the 'euphrasy and rue' with which we must 'purge our sight,' before we can receive and contemplate, as they are, the lineaments of truth and nature."

B. A. G.

## NOTICES OF RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

*A History of American Baptist Missions in Asia, Africa, Europe, and North America.* By WILLIAM GAMMELL, A. M., Professor in Brown University. With Maps and an Appendix. Boston: Gould, Kendall, & Lincoln. 1849. 12mo. pp. 359.

THE sectarian epithet used in the title of this volume suggests wellnigh enough of melancholy feeling to offset the grateful impressions excited by the narratives of devotion and zeal which are given in its contents. In no point of view do the effects of sectarian disputes, and of party lines drawn among Christians, strike us more forcibly, than as showing how such unchristian divisions have completely inverted the order of Christian truths and duties, and confounded the proportions and relative importance of precepts, doctrines, and ordinances. The symbol, emblem, or form has thus, in very many cases, displaced the truth which it signified, or the lesson which it was designed to convey. The distinctive peculiarity of the Baptist denomination is a remarkable exemplification of this fact. That denomination has the very smallest and most meagre basis of any of the larger Christian sects. Were it not for the eminent excellence of many of its prominent leaders for two centuries, we should be almost tempted to think that they had been trifling with the patience of Christians, or trying an experiment to see how much stress Christendom would allow to be laid on how trifling a distinction.

As we read the New Testament, illustrated by preceding and contemporaneous annals, we find that the peculiarity of the Gospel, about this matter of *Baptism*, was not in originating the rite nor in enjoining its form or method, but in connecting with it, as an ancient and familiar rite, a new meaning, a useful and a solemn lesson,—that of repentance,—and making it the symbol of a heart renewed. Christianity, so to speak, *baptized* baptism. John the Baptist found the rite as existing from immemorial practice, and he adopted it to signify the great truth and duty which was to prepare the hearts of men for the Gospel. We read that Jesus received baptism from John in order that he might show a respectful compliance with an established sacred observance. But Jesus himself baptized no one. Paley very justly remarks, in his sermon upon “Caution recommended in the Use and Application of Scripture Language,” “baptism was only another name for conversion.” The Saviour’s parting command to

his apostles might with all fairness be rendered "*Convert men to faith in the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost*"; that is, the mere rite or symbol connected with Christian proselytism was not to obtrude itself as even sharing the importance of the truth and duty which it impressed. So we find that when the rite itself began to be exaggerated, and made a matter of party dispute, St. Paul draws the broad distinction, "Christ sent me not to baptize, but to preach the Gospel"; and he thanks God that during his ministry he had baptized only Crispus and Gaius, and the household of Stephanus. (1 Cor. i. 14-17.) How could St. Paul have written thus, had the mere rite of baptism been invested with such supreme importance as our Baptist brethren attach to it, when they lay such stress, not only on the rite, but on the mode of its performance, as to take from it their sectarian epithet, and make its mode the condition of Christian fellowship and the basis of their exclusive organization for the work of missions and the distribution of the Holy Scriptures? How would they answer St. Paul in this matter, if he could ask of them their reasons face to face?

Having given expression to the opinion and the feeling which one word in the title of this volume has called forth from us, we take the more pleasure in bearing witness to the pure Christian devotion and faithfulness whose efforts and spirit are here recorded. Professor Gammell has performed the task which was committed to him in a most successful manner. Without exaggeration or the help of an over-wrought fancy, he has presented a plain and most interesting sketch of the laborers in the work of Christian missions under the patronage of the Baptist denomination. Their first two missionaries, Messrs. Judson and Rice, went from this country as believers in infant baptism, and as agents of the Congregational body, through the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions. These two pioneers adopted the views of the Baptists on their passage to India. The withdrawal of support from them by their former patrons led to their adoption by the American Baptists, and thus to the awakening of a lively concern in the work of missions in that denomination. From that beginning, Professor Gammell traces on the history of the cause. Through the perils of the ocean, of sickness and of war, and all the discomfitures attending a novel enterprise, such as international jealousies, financial embarrassments, the difficulties of acquiring foreign languages, and the disappointment of reasonable expectations on the part of some heathen objects of devoted and patient effort,—through all these trials and obstacles, we follow the steps of faithful men, supported by prayer and trust, and therefore sure of their final reward, in moderate success. The Baptists have supported missionaries in Asia, Africa, Europe, and

America, and have had the honor of sending forth some of the noblest examples of Christian heroism. Thus, too, by their efforts in behalf of the heathen, have they done much to foster true piety in their churches at home. No one can read this volume without having his spirit stirred within him by a new sense of the value of the Gospel, and by approving gratitude towards those pious and self-denying men and women, who have confronted themselves with heathenism, that they may displace its dark barbarism by the blessed religion of Jesus Christ.

---

*Narrative of the United States Expedition to the River Jordan and the Dead Sea.* By W. F. LYNCH, U. S. N., Commander of the Expedition. With Maps and numerous Illustrations. A New and Corrected Edition. Philadelphia : Lea & Blanchard. 1849. 8vo. pp. 508.

LIEUTENANT LYNCH seems to have first formed the design of making a careful and accurate survey of the regions around the river Jordan and the Dead Sea, in May, 1847, whilst his ship was lying before Vera Cruz, not long after the bombardment of that city by the American forces. He at once wrote to the Secretary of the Navy for permission to visit the Holy Land with that view, which was readily granted ; and the store-ship Supply was placed at his disposal. Having finished the necessary arrangements, he sailed from New York in the following November, with a small but picked body of officers and men ; and proceeded by way of Gibraltar and Port Mahon to Smyrna, where he left his vessel, and took a steamboat to Constantinople, in order to secure the protection and support of the Turkish government in the further prosecution of his undertaking. After some delay, he received the desired documents, and, returning to Smyrna, sailed immediately for Beïrût, whence he directed his course over land to his point of destination, arriving at the Sea of Galilee early in April. He then traced the channel of the Jordan through its entire length, and over a succession of rapids, till it empties into the Dead Sea, which he entered about the middle of the month. During the three weeks in which he remained on the shores of this mysterious lake, he examined every part of the surrounding country, and carefully noted the variations of the thermometer and barometer. At length he started on his return, and after visiting Jerusalem, Nazareth, and Damascus, reached Beïrût towards the end of June. And here, just as the expedition had completed its design, and was on the point of embarking for home, it had the misfortune to lose one of its most efficient members, — the late Lieutenant John B. Dale, of this city. To this amiable and accomplished officer much of the success which at-



tended the expedition is owing ; and the publication of the present narrative is due to his suggestion, while most of the engravings with which it is embellished are from sketches taken by him. He arrived at Beïrût in a state of great physical debility ; and after lingering for several weeks in a precarious condition, he died on the twenty-fourth of July, 1848. Although far from home, in a small and poor village, and in the midst of strangers, he was yet among friends, who watched over him with a tender and unceasing care. Private letters from them, which are now before us, show how greatly he had become endeared to them, and how truly they sympathized with those whose names were constantly on his lips in his dying hours. His memory will ever be fondly cherished by those who had the pleasure of knowing him. After his death, the expedition embarked for Malta, and arrived in this country early in December, after an absence of little more than a year.

The scientific results of this expedition possess great value, but how great can only be determined on the publication of the official report, in which the different measurements, and the thermometrical and barometrical observations will be stated with greater fulness and minuteness than would be desirable in a work like the present, chiefly designed for the general reader. The depression of the regions visited below the level of the Mediterranean Sea was accurately ascertained ; the various atmospheric changes were recorded ; the depth and density of the water in different parts of the Dead Sea were determined ; valuable maps were drawn ; and considerable information obtained in relation to the geological structure of the country. Still we experience a feeling of disappointment in contemplating its results, as narrated by Lieutenant Lynch himself, with his very natural and obvious desire to magnify its importance. In all that relates to his profession, he exhibited talent, experience, and good judgment in a high degree ; but, as he frankly admits in his Preface, he is " wholly unskilled in author-craft." While we gladly do honor to his generosity, his self-sacrifice, and his noble devotion to the cause of science, we cannot but regret that the literary execution of his work should be so unworthy of the head of a national expedition. Our author's style, though often inelegant and sometimes ungrammatical, is throughout ambitious and high-sounding. It is, however, in general, sufficiently clear, and at times has the precision of a log-book. His reflections and generalizations are almost invariably feeble and commonplace. The volume abounds with passages in the sophomoric style. His allusions to previous travellers are often unjust and captious ; nor are his own views beyond controversy. His attempts at Biblical criticism, in particular, are frequently of doubtful value, to say

the least ; and in his spelling of Turkish and Arabic names, he seems to have adopted no fixed standard. In many instances, his mode of spelling differs widely from the true orthography.

---

*The Seven Lamps of Architecture.* By JOHN RUSKIN, Author of "Modern Painters." With Illustrations, drawn and etched by the Author. New York: John Wiley, 161 Broadway. 1849. 12mo. pp. 186.

THE "Modern Painters" interested all, we believe, though it gave offence to many, and whatever may have been the value of some of its criticisms, that the author displayed excellent gifts could hardly be denied. The present work of Mr. Ruskin is so often in conflict with what is called "the spirit of the age," that he will not be surprised by the expression, in many quarters, of dissent from many of his conclusions. But in his clear statements and beautiful illustrations of the great principles of his favorite art, he will find, as one so earnest should, wide and deep sympathy. *Architecture*, as herein defined, is more than *Building*. It is the art which impresses upon a building a beautiful or venerable character, for a moral or intellectual purpose. It must have its great spiritual laws, more enduring than its most lasting monuments, unchanging as the wisdom of God and the nature of man. These laws are, "the Lamps of Architecture," "the Lamps of Sacrifice, Truth, Power, Beauty, Life, Memory, and Obedience." A structure must be reared at real cost, in sincerity, in strength, in beauty, and by one who lives in his work ; it is most noble when it is most enduring and historical, and when individual fancies are all loyally subordinated to an authorized style. That this statement of principles is exhaustive is not claimed, but it answers well all practical purposes.

The author earnestly pleads for costly temples, and putting the matter, with him, as between private extravagance and public munificence for spiritual purposes, we heartily assent to his conclusions, though we cannot feel the force of the argument from Scripture, upon which he so confidently relies. We should love to worship in temples where magnificence is not an intolerable burden upon the poor, a virtual exclusion of all persons of moderate means from the sacred walls. We would have the gifted artist employed upon the houses of God, before even the sanctuary of home, the hallowed enclosure of the hearth-stone, has been made beautiful and venerable by his skilful hands. Illumined by the lamp of Truth, we shall all at length see, with Mr. Ruskin, how poor a thing it is to "suffer the wall-decorator to erect about the altar frameworks and pediments daubed with

mottled color, and to dye in the same fashions such skeletons or caricatures of columns as may emerge above the pews," that "nobody wants ornaments in this world, but everybody wants integrity," and that it is better to "leave our walls as bare as a planed board, or to build them of baked mud and chopped straw, if need be, "than to rough-cast them with falsehood."

The author evidently does not enjoy railroad travelling, and whilst *en route*, is too nervous to think any ornament upon a station-house appropriate. The "Lamp of Beauty" must needs go out as the iron monster rushes by, and no one with his eye upon his luggage can stop to admire a Battlement or a Sphinx. In good time, Quiet and Beauty will come even here; but, for the present, so long as the terrible Locomotive crosses our country roads, upon the same level at every turn, and trains almost meet upon the same track every hour, taxing to the utmost the ingenuity of the most skilful superintendents,—so long as we must sell for fifty dollars to-day what cost a hundred dollars yesterday,—let us by all means strive for safety and cash payments, as the two things needful. We should like to go with Mr. Ruskin through many a street, and, "pulling down brackets, and friezes, and large names, restore to tradesmen the capital they had spent in architecture, and put them on honest and equal terms:—each with his name in block letters over the door, not skirted down the streets from the upper stories, and each with a plain wooden shop casement, with small panes in it, that people would not think of breaking in in order to be sent to prison." And most heartily do we assent to his plea under "the Lamp of Memory" for substantial dwelling-houses, dwellings for father, son, and grandson, to which a regard for ancestry and all home associations shall bind men in sweet contentment, when pride and luxury would counsel the destruction of the old, and the rearing of a new, dwelling.

There are many other interesting points to which we should love to call attention, but thus much must suffice. Even those who will not be able or disposed to study this work, in all its details, will find the shining of the sevenfold Lamp very cheerful and profitable, and sure we are that we need all its light to guide us in this dark time of architectural attempts, and, it must be added, of architectural failures.

---

*Ten Discourses on Orthodoxy.* By JOSEPH HENRY ALLEN, Pastor of the Unitarian Church, Washington. Boston: Wm. Crosby & H. P. Nichols. 1849. pp. 227.

Of these ten very able Discourses, the first describes the Orthodox theory of Christianity, as held in substance, though  
VOL. XLVII. — 4TH S. VOL. XII. NO. II. 26

with various modifications, by the churches called Evangelical. The second takes a general survey of that system, and states the objections to which it is liable, considered as a whole. The third, singling out the doctrine of the Trinity, traces its history, examines the arguments drawn from the sacred writings and other sources for its support, and asserts, in conclusion, that it never has been and never can be established as a truth. The fourth concerns itself with the proposition that Christ is God,—showing, first, that it rests on the wrong interpretation of a few passages of Scripture, while it is opposed by the general sense and spirit of the Bible,—and next, that, in all the modes in which it has been stated, it is and must be, as a religious doctrine, not only useless, but harmful. The fifth takes up the theory of vicarious atonement, and, having noticed the various forms in which it has been held, argues against its truth, from the insufficiency of the evidence brought to sustain it, and from the contradictory and impossible nature of the ideas which it involves. The sixth combats the dogma of man's native and total depravity, indicating the way in which it must have had its rise, directing attention to its monstrous character and frightful significance, demonstrating its lack of satisfactory proof both in the Divine word and in human experience, and describing the evil consequences, intellectual and moral, which result from it. The seventh, while it expounds and vindicates the doctrine of a righteous retribution in the future world, deducible from Scripture and acceptable to reason, urges objections to the Calvinistic view of endless and hopeless punishment for sins committed in this life, which, to reflecting minds, one would think must seem insuperable. The eighth discusses the character and claims of the Bible, exposing the falsity and bad tendency of the doctrine of plenary inspiration and verbal infallibility, at the same time that it explains and advocates what the writer regards as the true value and use of the sacred Scriptures. The ninth is occupied with the history and position of Orthodoxy, or with the elements and processes of its past development, and with the circumstances of its present condition, which indicate that it will soon be outgrown and superseded. The tenth is devoted to Liberal Christianity, stating what, in the author's view, its characteristic principles are, and what is the consummation to which they are leading, viz., "a system of religious faith beyond all comparison the most rich, complete, broad, lofty, and inspiring, that the world has ever seen."

In saying, as we have done, that these discourses are very able, we expressed only in part our opinion of their merits. They are composed in the author's best style, which, while it sometimes lacks precision and clearness, is always elevated, engaging, and impressive. They are distinguished by an inde-



pendence, freedom, and freshness of thought, and by a peculiar mode of approaching and treating subjects, which invest old themes with the interest and attractiveness of new ones. They give proof, on every page, of an honest, as well as of a vigorous and acute intellect; and the candid, fair, and kind spirit, which pervades them throughout, seems to us admirable, considering the writer's ecclesiastical position and the nature of the topics he was called upon to discuss. Mr. Allen professes to have spoken only in his own name, affirming that he has said nothing as the representative of a sect; yet we are gratified to find the views he has expressed to be, with perhaps two or three exceptions, the same that are entertained by Unitarians generally. As regards the question, What and where is the ultimate and decisive test of Christian truth? the majority of them will probably dissent from the opinion implied, if not declared, in some parts of the volume before us; and comparatively few, we think, would be pleased with the author's definition of *Liberal Christianity*, were it not for the assertion in his Preface, that he considers the present account as "a preparatory rather than a final statement of the Christian spiritual doctrine."

---

*Scripture Illustrated from Recent Discoveries in the Geography of Palestine; with a Map.* 1849. Svo. pp. 32.

*Scripture Vindicated against some Perversions of Rationalism. With a Sketch of the Lake of Galilee.* (Both) by the Author of "The People's Dictionary of the Bible." London: Simpkin, Marshall, & Co. 1849. Svo. pp. 48.

THESE two pamphlets are from the pen of the Rev. Dr. Beard, of Manchester, to whom the cause of Liberal Christianity is greatly indebted for many valuable works intended to secure the records of our faith from the artful violence of the Rationalist, and from the corruptions of a Calvinistic theology. His studies in Germany, his familiarity with the literature of that country, and his correspondence with some of its scholars, abundantly qualify him for an extensive editorial task, which he has recently undertaken. Under the title of "The Library of Christian Literature," he proposes to issue a series of publications, historical, religious, theological, and exegetical, designed to present the facts which attended the origin of the Christian faith, which illustrate its early annals and progress, and which exhibit its physical, historical, moral, social, and spiritual relations. The works are to be either original or translated. Of this plan we have the first fruits in these two pamphlets. They are both of them written in view of the most recent investigations into the

geography and natural history of Palestine, and show an amount of pains-taking, research, and study, and of critical skill, which could not fail of helping towards some marked result, either to invalidate or to confirm the Scripture history, and which we may rejoice to find admitting of so good a use as they subserve in these pages. Notwithstanding the faithful and scholarlike endeavours of Dr. Robinson to insure perfect accuracy in his statements, even he is proved at times to have erred. Dr. Beard presents with great beauty and force of language the local position of Palestine, its historical, moral, and religious relations to the civilization of the old world, of which it was the centre, and those facts in the configuration and products of the country, all of which offer numerous exact and minute coincidences in verification of the Bible narratives. He uses the compass, the barometer, and the theodolite, and we might almost say the microscope, to test the accuracy of the Biblical writers, and to trace out the unchanging features of that Land which was *Holy* while the gods of Greece were still slumbering unhewn in the marble quarries. The former of the pamphlets has peculiar reference to the Old Testament. The second contains a bold and keen rebuke of the quibbles and perversions of the Rationalistic writers, and traces out with remarkable ingenuity the incidental allusions which connect some of the miraculous narratives in the New Testament with facts relating to the Lake of Galilee, where the record describes the events as having occurred. We have been greatly interested in the purpose and plan of Dr. Beard's Library since we first saw his announcement, and we cannot but hope that he will be fully encouraged in it.

---

*The Bucolics, Georgics, and Æneid of Virgil: with English Notes, a Life of Virgil, and Remarks upon Scanning.* By EDWARD MOORE, M. A. Boston: B. B. Mussey & Co. 1849. 12mo. pp. 551.

NOTHING but actual practice in the work of teaching pupils can qualify any one to pronounce upon the relative merits of the numerous school editions of classic authors which are constantly issuing from the press in our Northern States. The text of the most familiar authors may be considered as settled, at least so far as not to require new editions of them for our schools and colleges. The range which is left open to editors, therefore, is confined to the extent and character of their illustrative Notes. The medium to be observed here lies between two obvious extremes. The pupil should be relieved of such difficulties in the allusions or construction of the text as would consume his time,

or require a larger apparatus than is at his disposal, should he undertake to solve them for himself; while, on the other hand, his author should not be interpreted and explained to him in any particular in which the grammar, the lexicon, and the classical dictionary afford him sufficient means for informing himself. Dr. Anthon's *Virgil* is too cumbersome and diffuse in its apparatus. Mr. Bowen's preserves the right medium, as far as we can pronounce an opinion, without having the qualification above named. The elegant volume before us seems to us to be just such a one as we should be glad to study for ourselves, if we were now beginning to acquaint ourselves with the Mantuan bard.

---

*The Elements of Reading and Oratory.* By HENRY MANDEVILLE, D. D., Professor of Moral Science and Belles-Lettres in Hamilton College. A New Revised Edition. New York: Appleton & Co. 1849. 12mo.

READING and Oratory have their rules, and yet it is very difficult to state them in an intelligent way. A book upon them has always seemed to us to resemble a volume on military tactics, especially when the lessons on the former subject are illustrated by diagrams explaining the *pitch*, the *rise*, the *fall*, the *circumflex*, the *bends*, *sweeps*, *slides*, and *closes*. We doubt whether it is possible to teach Reading and Oratory by a book, and without the help of a living voice. Our recent works on these subjects are sure, however, to have a value, as they embrace so many choice passages from the best authors. The volume before us contains the results of the author's teachings, and has evidently been prepared with much care and faithfulness, with a just appreciation of the importance of his theme, and an intelligible statement of the means by which art may help nature. It will be found to convey most useful lessons upon Pronunciation, Punctuation, Modulation of the Voice, and Emphasis, and to include striking examples of its own rules in its illustrative extracts.

---

*Select Comedies; Translated from the Italian of Goldoni, Giraud, and Nota.* New York: Appleton & Co. 1849. 12mo. pp. 306.

THAT everything suffers by *translation* except a bishop, is a true saying, and that form of literature which suffers most is the comic or humorous. Happy turns of thought, rather than what we call wit, are said to distinguish Italian comedies. The trans-

lator of the contents of this volume conceals his name. A brief introduction on the Italian comic drama, and biographical and critical sketches of the three authors, from each of whom he has given us two plays, add to the value of the book to an English reader.

---

*Class Book of Zoölogy: Designed to afford to Pupils in Common Schools and Academies a Knowledge of the Animal Kingdom: With a List of the Different Species found in the State of New York. The Whole Scientifically and Systematically Arranged.* By Professor B. JAEGER. New York: Appleton & Co. 1849. 16mo. pp. 180.

THE large sciences which relate to Animals, Birds, Reptiles, Fishes, Insects, and that heterogeneous class of creatures to which belong Corals, Shell-fish, and Worms, are all compressed into this little volume, which is also richly illustrated. Under a simple and natural classification of its subjects, short sentences of descriptive details, and of historical and local information, are given in a way to interest a pupil, and these are followed by questions which are founded on them, and which the pupil who has carefully read what precedes will be able and pleased to answer.

---

*A Review of the Causes and Consequences of the Mexican War.* By WILLIAM JAY. Boston: B. B. Mussey & Co. 1849. 12mo. pp. 333.

JUDGE JAY has here given a very thorough and able history of the causes and consequences of our recent unhappy strife with a neighbouring republic. He has treated his sad theme as might have been expected of so earnest a man. Dark as this chapter in our history is, it needed to be so written, by a judicious, generous, earnest, and free soul. We thank him for his labor of love, and cannot but mourn that those who need this discussion will not enter upon it, and that those who will, do not need it. The length will deter some, the freshness of the incidents will prevent others, from rehearsing the familiar tale, and more still have already made up their minds for or against the whole affair, and do not care to "review" the grounds of their conviction.

We may be permitted to add that it was written for the prize offered by the American Peace Society, was received very favorably by the judges, and is now published by the author himself under their sanction. The essay which obtained the prize was by Rev. A. A. Livermore, and will, we trust, soon appear from the press, now that its author has returned from the South.



*Last Leaves of American History: Comprising Histories of the Mexican War and California.* By EMMA WILLARD. New York: George P. Putnam. 1849. 12mo. pp. 230.

It would require a much larger and more elaborate volume than this to do justice to its themes. The authoress aims at impartiality. She begins with the election of President Harrison, and ends with the rush to the Gold Mines, and includes a record of dates, facts, and incidents in which there was little chance for showing any bias or opinion of her own. She is, at least, a lenient, if not an unfair narrator of the conduct and course of our government in the Mexican War, though she joins with many patriots and Christians of our day in hoping that henceforward a Council of Peace, rather than an appeal to arms, may decide international disputes.

---

*European Life and Manners, in Familiar Letters to Friends.* By HENRY COLMAN, Author of "European Agriculture," &c. 2 vols. Boston: Little & Brown. 1849. 12mo. pp. 360, 392.

THESE volumes are no fair subjects of criticism, as their publication was not had in view when their contents were written. They prove that Mr. Colman had what is called "a good time" abroad. The Letters are filled with spirited delineations of household and social life in Europe; they dwell with admiring appreciation upon the gatherings of luxury and elegance by which the favored classes seek to make life a perfect romance of enjoyment, though they by no means leave unmentioned the degradation and misery of other classes. Mr. Colman's volumes are full of information and of details of a character to interest a large number of readers.

---

*Visits to Monasteries in the Levant.* By the Hon. ROBERT CURZON. New York: George P. Putnam. 1849. 12mo. pp. 390.

*Adventures in the Libyan Desert, and the Oasis of Jupiter Ammon.* By BAYLE ST. JOHN. New York: George P. Putnam. 1849. 12mo. pp. 244.

MR. PUTNAM uniformly makes a judicious selection from foreign publications in his reprints, and does his readers the favor of giving them the best materials in type and paper. These two

new volumes on the East treat of fresh themes, not yet hackneyed by tourists. Mr. Curzon has given us most valuable historical and literary information, with lively sketches and anecdotes from scenes which are invested with the mystery and the romance of the past, and which present many matters of intelligent curiosity. Mr. St. John is a graceful writer, and makes the most of incidents in his wanderings over a region which will never cease to address human sentiments with grave appeals and reminiscences.

---

*The Four Gospels, translated from the Latin Vulgate, and diligently compared with the original Greek text, being a revision of the Rhemish translation, with Notes, critical and explanatory.* By FRANCIS PATRICK KENRICK, Bishop of Philadelphia. New York. Edward Dunigan & Brother, 151 Fulton Street. 1849. pp. 572.

THE appearance of a volume like the present will no doubt surprise many of our readers. A revised translation of the Gospels, by a Roman Catholic bishop, was altogether unexpected. Within a short time, numerous editions of the Douay Bible have been published in this country in various forms, some with very beautiful engravings from ancient pictures by the best masters, and issued in numbers at a price which enables almost any one who desires it, to possess a copy. Nor is the interest confined to our own country. A Roman Catholic bishop, not long since, boasted, that he had been instrumental in the publication and circulation of a greater number of Bibles in Ireland than any other clergyman, Protestant or Catholic.

These things indicate an interest in the sacred Scriptures, which it is generally, and probably justly supposed, has not heretofore existed in the Catholic Church, and a willingness or necessity which that church has felt to comply with the demands of the times. We welcome, therefore, this volume, not only as a valuable acquisition to the Biblical literature of the country, but still more, as one of the auspicious signs of the times.

We cannot but notice the candor and affection, with which the author alludes to his having occasionally availed himself "of the researches of modern writers, *unhappily estranged from Catholic communion.*"

We shall not at this time attempt any criticism on the character of the work, but commend it to the consideration of all biblical students.

*Speeches, Poems, and Miscellaneous Writings on Subjects connected with Temperance and the Liquor Traffic.* By CHARLES JEWETT, M. D. Boston: J. P. Jewett. 1849. 12mo. pp. 200.

DR. JEWETT has been known for years throughout this State, and largely in New England, as one of the most efficient, good-tempered, genial, and untiring agents in the cause of Temperance. He has been the guest of many households, and has spoken in church, school-house, hall, grove, and by the roadside. Those who have heard him with delight will be glad to possess this volume, which is graced with an excellent likeness of him. The volume contains seven of his speeches, some lively poems, and several excellent contributions of his to the newspapers.

---

*The Beauties of Channing.* With an Essay prefixed. By WILLIAM MOUNTFORD. London: J. Chapman. 1849. 16mo. pp. 251.

THE Author of *Martyria* might be better trusted than most men to make one of those uncertain volumes called the "Beauties" of any well-known and favorite writer. A work which would be beyond measure distasteful and conceited in a writer who should himself cull out passages from his own books and give them that title, may yet be performed by another. Mr. Mountford has exercised good taste in his selection, and has not made it at the expense of sense or completeness of sentiment. His own Essay is not the least valuable portion of his volume.

---

REV. MR. WEISS, of New Bedford, in a sermon upon Capital Punishment, (8vo, pp. 16,) Luke x., 36, 37, maintains that we should generalize upon the Gospel duty of mercy so as to extend its relief and pity and forgiveness to all social crimes, with the same sympathy with which individuals exercise it in private life toward the unfortunate and the erring, and that by this rule we are bound to allow the murderer to live, and to reform him.

The Fifteenth Annual Report of the Executive Committee of the Benevolent Fraternity of Churches (8vo, pp. 66) presents the operations and results of that Christian combination for charitable purposes in a more interesting and impressive form than does or did any previous Report. The narratives and statistics which were given at the Annual Meeting, and the accounts which Rev. Dr. Bigelow and Rev. Messrs. Cruft and Winckley here render of their visits and labors, and of the calls upon their time

and sympathies, are of intense interest. They are free from exaggeration, and make strong appeals to every Christian heart.

Rev. Mr. Clark, of Trinity Church, Boston, in his Discourse before the Ancient and Honorable Artillery Company, on their CCXlth Anniversary, (8vo, pp. 22,) treats of the "Relations of the Past to the Present," in an instructive, though a very general way, and thus avoids the theme which that time-honored anniversary almost thrusts upon the successive ministers who are invited to preach upon it, at this era, when the cause of Peace is so ably advocated, and the question of a Congress of Nations is so earnestly debated.

Mr. W. W. Greenough entitles his Oration before the Municipal Authorities of Boston on July 4, 1849, (8vo, pp. 40,) "The Conquering Republic"; but in applying that title to our republic, he claims for us a victory partly won, and still to be won, by force of the great ideas which are the basis of its constitution. He traces the effects of our Revolution upon the governments of the old world, considers our position at home and our foreign relations, and then enforces our duties under our light and obligations. The Oration is free from that bombast and fustian which are found in most addresses on like occasions. Its style is good, and its sentiments are humane and just.

Mr. W. S. Barton, of Worcester, has published "Epitaphs from the Cemetery on Worcester Common, with occasional Notes, References, and an Index." (8vo, pp. 36.) None of these inscriptions are old enough or quaint enough to have the interest of antiquity; but they may be of use to the many patient investigators of genealogical matters, who seem to be becoming somewhat numerous among us.

Rev. Professor Post, of St. Louis, delivered a "Discourse" in that city on December 24, 1848, "in Commemoration of the Pilgrim Fathers." (8vo, pp. 48.) If the theme could always be treated with the good judgment, the discrimination, and the knowledge of history which this speaker brought to it, it would not be subject to the ridicule and slights which have recently attached to it. This Discourse, with occasional slips in taste, is an admirable historical and philosophical summary of those matters which it would naturally embrace.

Rev. Mr. Stebbins, of the Meadville Theological School, has published, by request of the First Congregational Society in Leominster, of which he was formerly pastor, a discourse which he delivered on a transient visit to that scene of his ministry, on July 22, 1849. (8vo, pp. 20.) The house of worship, which is to be remodelled, was used on that day for the last time. The occasion was exactly twelve years from the day on which he preached there his first discourse as a candidate. Here was sug-



gestive material enough for a tender address, and for the renewed enforcement of Christian counsel, which Mr. Stebbins most happily and devoutly improves. His passing tribute to his immediate successor, the late Hiram Withington, is affecting, though we cannot approve the sentence in which Mr. Stebbins, in contrasting his own rougher methods with the gentle way of that successor, compares himself and Mr. Withington, respectively, to John the Baptist and the Saviour.

Messrs. C. S. Francis & Co., of New York, are publishing in numbers, each containing four plates, with Scriptural Extracts, "Franklin's Bible Cartoons, for the School and the Family." Two numbers have been issued, and, we should think, are well suited to their purpose of interesting and impressing the young. The cheapness at which they are furnished — each plate costing but three cents — will put them within the reach of all. We have, thus far, illustrations of scenes in the life of Abraham and the life of Joseph, and the engravings are skilfully made. A rich field is before the artist.

Mr. Bartlett, of Cambridge, has published, in handsome form, (8vo, pp. 60,) "Addresses at the Inauguration of Jared Sparks, LL.D., as President of Harvard College." The pamphlet contains a Prefatory Note, which gives a sketch of the proceedings of the Inauguration day and its festivities; the Latin and English Poems which were sung; the Address of Induction by Gov. Briggs, with the President's Reply; the Latin Oration by Charles Francis Choate, of the class just graduated; and the Inaugural Address of Dr. Sparks. This last document contains a concise historical sketch of collegiate education among us; of its distinctive features; of the method under which it is at present pursued, and the speaker's views of certain processes and incidental features, concerning which there is a difference of opinion.

"The Seventeenth Annual Report of the Trustees of the Perkins Institution for the Blind," (Metcalf and Co., 8vo, pp. 56,) is an unusually interesting document. We always look for something from this quarter annually which shall instruct and deeply move us, and it is surprising how inexhaustible in interest is the theme of this charity. We do not find any thing in the Report this year on Laura Bridgman, whose name and history are so familiar now in both hemispheres. The pages are filled with information concerning the Blind, their misfortunes, claims, and improvement, and a particular attention is called to the better provision of workshops and occupation, and to the separation of the sexes.

## INTELLIGENCE.

## RELIGIOUS INTELLIGENCE.

*Cambridge Divinity School.*—The Annual Discourse before the Graduating Class of this Institution was delivered on Sunday evening, July 15, by Rev. F. H. Hedge, of Bangor, Me. His subject was, "The State and Wants of the Unitarian Churches." Any observing judge in our community, who should read only the titles and subjects of the numerous annual addresses which are delivered before the various societies gathered in our religious body, could not fail to remark, that in each period of one, two, or three years, as the case may be, the length of the period depending upon the relative importance and interests of each successive theme, some one subject of temporary prominence is treated by all our chosen speakers, according to their peculiar views of it. It is thus, and thus only, that, by the action of many independent minds, exaggerations and disproportionate views find adjustment. The circle of truth is completed when those who are standing at the extremities of its radii, and looking towards a common centre, are numerous enough and friendly enough to join hands together. Mr. Hedge contributed his full proportion of earnest and genial help towards defining the relation between theology and practical religion.

The Thirty-Third Annual Visitation of the Divinity School took place in the Chapel of the University, on Monday, July 16. President Sparks occupied the desk. The exercises were opened and closed with prayers by Professors Francis and Noyes, and three original hymns, written by members of the School, were sung at intervals.

The Class, which at the beginning of the last academical year consisted of ten members, had lost one of them. Two others had been obliged to leave, just before the close of the term, in pursuit of health;—Mr. E. P. Bond of Boston, the subject of whose essay would have been "The Promise of the Paraclete, John xvi. 7," having gone to the Pacific, after ordination, as an evangelist, as stated in our last number; and Mr. W. H. Hurlburt, whose theme would have been "Logic and Induction as Sources of Religious Faith," having recently sailed for Europe, to study in Germany. The other members of the graduating class read dissertations on the following subject, connected with their names:—"The Causes of the Loss of Christian Faith at the Present Day," by Mr. Fiske Barrett, a graduate of Union College, Schenectady, N. Y.; "The Character of the Intimations of a Future Life in the Old Testament," by Mr. W. F. Bridge, a graduate of Harvard College; "The Ethics of Christianity as compared with those of the Grecian Philosophy," by Mr. G. A. Carnes, a graduate of the University of New York; "William Penn," by Mr. R. P. Rogers; "The Visible and Invisible Church," by Mr. Davis Smith, a graduate of Harvard College; "Literature as a Qualification for the Ministry," by Mr. J. A. Swan, a graduate of Harvard College; "Christian Fellowship," by Mr. Augustus Woodbury.

After the exercises, the ministers, candidates for the ministry, the members of this and of other theological schools, official visitors and other invited guests, partook of a dinner in Harvard Hall.

The annual meeting of the Alumni of the School was held, after dinner, in the Chapel. The following gentlemen were chosen as the officers of the association for the coming year:—Rev. Professor George R. Noyes, D. D., *President*; Rev. Ralph Sanger, *Vice-President*; Rev. John F. W. Ware, *Secretary*; Rev. George G. Ingersoll, D. D., Rev. William Newell, and Rev. Artemas B. Muzzey, *Committee of Arrangements*. The Rev. Francis Parkman, D. D., of Boston, and the Rev. Samuel Gilman, D. D., of Charleston, S. C., who had been chosen first and second preachers, having both recently notified the committee that they should not be able to officiate, the Rev. Edward B. Hall, D. D., of Providence, R. I., had been invited, and had consented to deliver the Annual Address this year. The association proceeded to choose first and second preachers for the next year, and elected Rev. Ezra S. Gannet, D. D., of Boston, and Rev. Calvin Lincoln, of Fitchburg. A discussion on the condition and wants of the School was commenced before the Address, and resumed afterwards. Dr. Hall's Address will be found in our preceding pages.

---

*The Fast on Account of the Cholera.* — A private document of a few lines from the City of Washington, signed "Z. Taylor," and entitled "A Recommendation to the People of the United States," had the effect of calling together larger or smaller congregations in the churches of this Union, on the third day of August, for the purpose of taking a religious view of the cholera. That scourge has been very fatal in its visitations in some portions of our Union, and has been dreaded everywhere. If a collection could be made of all the sermons preached in this country on that day, it would afford a singular exhibition of the wide variety of opinions and religious views which so remarkably distinguishes this land of all sorts of creeds and consciences. The idea which lies at the basis of the custom by which a "Fast Day" is appointed on account of a prevailing epidemic, is, that such a melancholy occasion manifests "an especial providence of God." Once the faith in these special interventions of God, for purposes of public chastisement, embraced many calamities and many portents, as belonging to that dreaded method of Divine discipline. Eclipses, comets, meteors, volcanic eruptions, earthquakes, the visits of locusts, palmer-worms, and caterpillars, droughts, famines and tempests, wars and pestilences, have served as occasions to excite religious feeling, and to exercise it in humiliation and propitiatory rites, for the sake of appeasing the anger of God. The line of history might be traced down through successive ages to show how truer views of the laws of nature, the progress of science, and more just interpretations of the Divine attributes and agency have stricken, from that list of vengeful terrors, one after another of those formidable omens and calamities. The highest religious philosophy teaches us that there are no special providences, because there is a general and a universal providence. Even the revelation of God by Jesus Christ, as a seemingly peculiar and special manifestation of God's wisdom and love, becomes all the more easy of faith when the plan which appeared to find its fulfilment in one year of time is traced through all previous ages of Jewish and patriarchal preparation, is made the one great providential design for humanity "before the foundation of the world," and is not to find its full triumph till all are gathered

into Jesus Christ long centuries hence. If the sparrow is supported in its flight and guided to its own nest, and if the hairs of our heads are all numbered, what more special providence could we look for than this universal watchfulness and control exercised by a good Being through all his infinite realm? The belief in special providences is evidently borrowed and retained from an old philosophy, and is an accommodation of the Divine nature and government to human conceptions. We do some parts of our work more carefully and earnestly than we do other parts of it; we vary the mood of our minds; we exhibit in turn anger and love. These traits of humanity men transferred to God when they conceived of him as "altogether such a one as themselves." They thought that he was more distinctly and visibly revealed here and there than elsewhere; that he threw more of his agency into one event than another; that he smiled or frowned as men gave him occasion; that the gentle breeze, and the healthful air, and the bright sun, and the constant heavens, indicated his love, while the cloud, the storm, the meteor, the eclipse, the blight, the pestilence, were tokens of his wrath. Men have not only presumed thus to infer in a calamity that God was temporarily displeased, but they have also ventured to indicate the particular sin, local, national, or general, against which his indignation was aimed. The list of these so-called special providences has been greatly diminished, as we have said, by higher views of religion and the progress of science; and now the old faith; which we cannot but call a superstition, concentrates itself on a pestilence, as the last remaining calamity which we interpret as a token of the Divine displeasure.

We should infer, from the accounts which we have seen in the newspapers from various parts of the country, that the third of August was observed with more of seriousness, religious feeling, and respectful regard, than we had previously supposed that it would receive. So far as this fact indicates the general prevalence and the amount of true religious belief and sentiment, we are gratified. But we should not make the manner in which such a day was observed or slighted the test of the religion of a country. Doubtless thousands paid the day no regard, not because of their indifference to religion, but because the occasion, and the popular view of it, did not engage their own convictions, — did not appeal to any sincere sentiment in their own hearts concerning the Divine dealings. They did not see in the cholera any special manifestation of God's anger, because it is but one of the many agencies of death, the common lot, and not so destructive an agency among us as is the scarlet-fever and consumption annually. They did not see in the cholera a plague sent to chastise us on account of our last war, or for the sin of slavery; because the cholera has traversed the earth, and devastated all nations. Nor did they see in the cholera a peculiar visitation against intemperance and vice and wretched poverty in cities; because those evils are marked by a daily and a constant warning and rebuke, and are indeed rather aggravated than diminished by the inroads of pestilence. There are many persons now in Christendom, and their number is increasing, who cannot believe in a vengeful God, nor in any providence but a general providence. They must refer everything to God, or nothing. They must regard the death of a thousand by disease, as they would regard the death of one; nor can they look upon a new distemper, which perhaps may take the place of an old and obsolete one, as a new method attempted by the Almighty to bring men to repentance.



There is no objection to interpreting the cholera as a judgment of God against sin, provided that this one calamity or trial is not singled out, emphasized, and made to bear the whole stress of that righteous government, which has so many other indications and warnings. These last are always forgotten when any one calamity is represented as of peculiar significance in indicating God's displeasure at wickedness. Every offence and disobedience receives its just recompense of reward. We are most likely to interpret God's providence aright in single instances, when we are watchful of its general lessons. We see his hand most distinctly in some things, when we search for it in everything. He is not like Baal, at times on a journey, at times sleeping; but verily he is a God that judgeth in the whole earth.

We apprehend that the Presidential Fast Day was most religiously used in those congregations where the pulpits, after giving due utterance to those solemn counsels which our mortal state, our exposure, and our sinfulness make always timely, and, on some occasions, peculiarly impressive, passed on to inculcate the homely duties of cleanliness, caution, a cheerful courage, and a helpful sympathy for the suffering.

---

*The Visit of Father Mathew.* — The Rev. Theobald Mathew, an Irish Roman Catholic Priest, and honorably known throughout Christendom for his devoted zeal and his eminently successful labors in the cause of Temperance among his countrymen, is now pursuing his beneficent work in our towns and cities. His visit is made to wear a peculiar aspect, and were it not for his own single-hearted constancy to one purpose, would be turned aside from the object of his mission, through force of the adulation and enthusiasm which attend him. Thus far, his course here has been as through a perfect pageant. The civic authorities have received him with processions, and garlands, and banquets, and speeches. All sects and parties have united to do him honor. Even the veteran Dr. Beecher, than whom the Pope of Rome has not a colder friend, certainly on this continent, has grasped Father Mathew by the hand on a public platform, and hailed him as a brother, in at least one Christian work. The enthusiasm which our Irish residents exhibit towards their venerated friend and benefactor, is wellnigh surpassed by the cordial and earnest efforts of our own Protestant people to do him honor. We sincerely hope that there may be no violent reaction or revulsion of feeling. We are obliged to confess that in some former similar cases, — though no one exactly like this has ever presented itself, — enthusiasm, applause, and public honors have exceeded the bounds of due reason towards distinguished foreign visitors, and have been followed by fault-finding, coldness, and even defamation. Let no such reaction be the penalty which Father Mathew shall be called to meet by and by.

He has thus far made a most favorable impression, founded on a conviction of his high services, and on his modest deportment. His countenance bears a mingled expression of dignity and benevolence; he is most affable and unassuming in speech, and endures very patiently some things which he doubtless might wish to avoid. But one public slight has as yet been cast upon him. Seven years since, he signed with Daniel O'Connell, and seventy thousand other Irishmen, an address to their countrymen in the United States, urging them to an uncompromising hostility against the institution of slavery, as it exists here. Pro-

ceeding upon this fact, a committee of the Massachusetts Anti-Slavery Society addressed an invitation to Father Mathew, as they did to some other distinguished men, to attend a celebration of the British Act of Emancipation in the West Indies, to be held at Worcester on the third day of August. To insure the reception of the invitation, and to leave no room for doubt in the matter, Mr. W. L. Garrison and Dr. H. I. Bowditch waited upon Father Mathew at his lodgings in Boston a week previous to the celebration. Mr. Garrison gives his account of the interview in "The Liberator" for August 10. He says, that, after the usual compliments, he delivered the letter of invitation, with a verbal statement of its contents; that Father Mathew received it "with some agitation and embarrassment of manner, and said, gesticulating in a somewhat deprecative manner, as though an indecent or unworthy proposition had been made to him, 'I have as much as I can do to save men from the slavery of intemperance, without attempting the overthrow of any other kind of slavery. Besides, it would not be proper for me to commit myself on a question like this, under present circumstances. I am a Catholic Priest; but being here to promote the cause of temperance, I should not be justified in turning aside from my mission, for the purpose of subserving the cause of Catholicism.' [Mr. Brownson says one should say *Catholicity*.] It was in vain that Father Mathew was reminded that *humanity* was a broad and universal cause, and that he had signed the Irish address: he would neither attend the celebration, nor answer the written invitation. He is, of course, 'an enemy of the Slave,' 'a hater of God and man,' and 'a clerical dealer in human blood.'"

Of the effects of Father Mathew's labors here in the cause of Temperance only time can decide. We hope that they will be unexceptionably and incalculably good; but we are not so sanguine as some around us. We utterly disapprove of the pledge being exacted of young children, or of any man or woman under excitement. All the power and influence which Father Mathew bears with him over and above what is exerted by other agents in that great cause, comes from the prestige of his priestly character, and therefore a part of it is to be ascribed to the superstition of his countrymen. We have not forgotten that a Roman Catholic council at Baltimore, a few years ago, decreed that the Pledge was not to be looked upon as a religious vow, the breaking of which was mortal sin. But if it is not a religious vow, what force has it to a Roman Catholic? If Father Mathew can make the Pledge more sacred than it has been regarded by some of his countrymen, he will have a permanent, and not a merely temporary effect upon them. We look upon him with unqualified respect, and heartily desire from his mission good fruits, which shall be as lasting and as extensive as his own well-deserved fame.

---

*The French Intervention in Rome.* — The much vexed controversy, as to whether a better knowledge of events, of their causes and influence, is possessed by those who are living when they occur, or is obtained by those who afterwards read of them as history, may find an argument in support of the latter side, in the recent strange proceedings of a French army in the States of the Church. Who, of all our contemporaries, save the few who are parties to the secret diplomacy of cabinets, has any real knowledge, or can impart any reliable information, concerning

the most unparalleled piece of impertinence and effrontery that was ever witnessed in modern times? Who can or will tell us on what pretence, by what instigation, for what purpose, a republic founded one year in revolution, and far from having assured its own existence, even for the next year, presumes to send out an army to prevent the imitation of its own act by another people, who had more to complain of, and a better right to try their strength against tyranny, because that tyranny showed itself in a more hateful form? What sent the French to Rome? What business had they there? How comes it that Protestant Christendom could look on the recent struggle, in which the wrong party appears to have triumphed, and allow such base and overbearing iniquity? We will confess to having felt some surprise, that, excitable and jealous for republican liberty and institutions as our own people are, the suggestion, at least, did not find public utterance among us for a volunteer expedition from this country to aid the Romans. The prohibition which our own laws pass upon such intermeddling, and which was held up as a restraint over those who meditated, a few years since, the offer of efficient help to the Greeks and to the Poles,—this prohibition would not have alone stifled the expression of a desire to rush to the rescue of the Roman republic. Doubtless our own recent doings in Mexico have reminded us of the proverb about those who live in glass houses, and have tied the tongues of many. We are inclined, however, to account for the seeming apathy and indifference of Protestant Christendom to the outrage which the French have perpetrated, by ascribing it more to amazement, wonder, an astounding surprise excited by the conduct of the French, and to a deliberate waiting for some explanation of it, which, it was taken for granted, would soon be forthcoming. But how long must we wait for it? Are only our posterity to know it as history, while contemporaries are to ask in vain for that explanation? Shall it be deferred till some years hence, when state secrets and diplomatic papers are published? We cannot but think that our children will know more about the matter than we do. We have searched in vain through the abundant paragraphs of French and English journals, through reports of debates, and the long columns of correspondence from Italy and France, to learn under what instigation, for what end, by what warrant, the French Republic sent an army to Rome, which, after having besieged the city, and battered down its walls, and entered it without capitulation, by a surrender at discretion, has established there a military rule, has set over it a military governor, and published military enactments and orders to its citizens. The whole affair is enveloped in a dark mystery. No reason or plea has been given for these proceedings, except such as are so manifestly shallow and evasive as to be ludicrously unsatisfactory. Even in the English Parliament, when members, teased by curiosity, or vexed by the well-kept secret of such marvellous proceedings, have called for information from the leaders of the English government, there has been a most dainty and reluctant notice taken of their questions, and an instantaneous changing of the subject, without debate, save in one instance.

The only approach which the French have made towards an explanation, and this appears solely in the brief official documents of General Oudinot, and in one declaration made by a cabinet minister in the French Assembly, intimates two different and inconsistent pleas to justify the French in intermeddling with Rome. The one plea is, that it was in-



tended to prevent the ascendancy which Austria might gain over the Roman republic. But if there was reason, as doubtless there was, for such an apprehension, the French republic had no more business to interfere than had Great Britain or Russia, and the time for interference would not come until Austria had actually made an adverse attempt; and then the method of interference would have been, not for France to have assailed Rome, but to have pitted itself against Austria. The other plea is, that the so-called Roman Republic is but the temporary ascendancy of a band of foreign adventurers and bandits, combined with a worthless mob of lawless men in the city, and that the French army went to defend the true citizens and people of Rome, and her young freedom, from the desperate counsels and the dangerous rule of General Garibaldi and the triumvirs. Very well. Let France publish the call for help, the invitation and appeal which she received from these order and priest-loving citizens, and then this latter plea will hold good. But, till that public announcement is made, well authenticated, and proved to have been ratified to the French Cabinet as earnest and reasonable, and expressive of the large majority of wills and wishes of the Roman people, we must conclude that a great secret lies at the bottom of the whole affair. The only alternative is to suppose that the French had no definite object in view, that they acted from a merely impulsive instigation, which was precipitately followed, and has involved a train of unforeseen consequences, leading them on farther than they had ever imagined, and bringing them to a result which has exceedingly embarrassed them. This supposition derives much support from the fact that the French now find themselves in a most ridiculous position as the masters of Rome, and at a loss what to do in that position; — self-constituted umpires between two, or, as they say, three parties, — the Pope, the soldiers, and the citizens, — neither of which invited their interference, or will accept their terms.

One thing is certain. The temporal power of the Pope has come to its end; or if it be for the moment reinforced by arms, it will be only to find a final overthrow in the first establishment of peaceful order. It remains to be proved whether there can be a Pope of the Church without a civil realm. The great adversary offered to the Saviour "the kingdoms of the world, with all their glory," but the Saviour declined them. The Pope accepted the offer from the same tempter, who did not own what he has attempted to give away, and so has never fully kept his promise; but so far as he has fulfilled his contract, he has brought confusion and trouble on hundreds of the Popes. Let Pius Ninth make a cheerful effort to annul the contract.

---

*Unitarian Chapel at Bridgeport, Ct.* — The widow of the late Hon. Roger Gerard Van Polanen, has long had at heart the erection of a place of worship at Bridgeport, where the simple Gospel of Jesus Christ might be preached, without the mixture of human inventions. We are glad that her wish approaches to its fulfilment. On Thursday, June 21, the corner stone of an edifice, to be called the Polanen Chapel, — in commemoration of a worthy Christian man, — was laid in that place, with appropriate religious services, conducted by Rev. F. A. Farley, of Brooklyn, N. Y., whose most efficient help has been chiefly instrumental in gathering a band of worshippers as the foundation of a society there.



The fee of the chapel is to be vested in the American Unitarian Association, who will pay an interest of six per cent. to Madame Van Polanen, at whose cost it is erected, during her natural life.

---

*Ordinations.*—MR. CHARLES M. TAGGART, a graduate of the Meadville Theological School, was ordained as Pastor of the Unitarian Church and Society in Albany, N. Y., on Tuesday, July 31. The Introductory Services were by the Rev. John Pierpont, of Troy, N. Y.; Rev. Orville Dewey, D. D., preached the Sermon; Rev. S. J. May, of Syracuse, N. Y., offered the Prayer of Ordination; Professor Stebbins, of Meadville, Pa., gave the charge; Rev. Mr. Heywood, of Louisville, gave the Fellowship of the Churches; and Dr. Dewey offered the concluding Prayer.

MR. AUGUSTUS WOODBURY, of the class graduating this year from the Theological School at Cambridge, was ordained as Pastor of the Second Congregational Church and Society in Concord, N. H., on Wednesday, August 1. The Introductory Prayer was offered by Rev. S. G. Bulfinch, of Nashville, N. H.; Selections from Scripture were read by Rev. J. C. Smith, of Groton; Rev. A. P. Peabody, of Portsmouth, N. H., preached the Sermon; Rev. C. T. Thayer, of Beverly, offered the Prayer of Ordination; Rev. Calvin Lincoln, of Fitchburg, gave the Charge; Rev. F. P. Appleton, of Danvers, gave the Fellowship of the Churches; Rev. M. G. Thomas, former Pastor of the church, now of New Bedford, addressed the People; and Rev. A. A. Livermore, of Keene, N. H., offered the concluding Prayer.

---

#### LITERARY INTELLIGENCE.

*Harvard College Commencement.*—This most ancient literary festival in our land took place on Wednesday, July 18th, in the Church of the First Parish, Cambridge. The time for the annual commencement was changed this year, or rather restored, to the day which begins the summer vacation,—that is, six weeks earlier than heretofore, when it was held at the close of vacation. The change is not without objections, though it has the obvious advantage of allowing the members of the graduating class to perform their parts and take their degrees at the close of the term, instead of obliging them to return to Cambridge after their studies were finished and they had been scattered, many of them to distant homes. A coincidence which never occurred before was realized on this occasion. Besides the present Governor of the Commonwealth, and the present President of the College, there were on the stage two ex-governors, and two ex-presidents; the Hon. Edward Everett, in his single person, answering to both titles, the Hon. John Davis, former Governor of the State, and now member of the United States Senate, and the venerable ex-President Quincy. A large number of gentlemen, distinguished for learning, for station and personal worth, crowded the platform, and every part of the church was filled. The exercises commenced at 10 o'clock, A. M., and were not closed till after 3 o'clock, P. M.

Seventy-eight young men, members of the graduating class, received

the degree of Bachelor of Arts. Honors, in the shape of *parts*, were assigned to thirty-five of this number, seven of whom did not appear on the stage. One Latin and one Greek Oration gave proof to the audience that those languages were still studied in the College, further proof of which was found in the programme of the exercises and in the announcements by the President. No ludicrous or humorous dialogue, such as diversifies the grave performances at some other of our colleges, has ever been indulged in at Cambridge. There was very great variety in the subjects of the orations, dissertations, essays, and disquisitions, and a far larger proportion of them than we have ever noticed before bore upon themes of present and popular interest. "The Pilgrim Fathers," of course, were not forgotten; never may they be, on that spot! — nor "The Last Hours of Socrates." But the themes of "Mental Epidemics," "Newspapers," "The Earth and Man," "The Multiplication of Books," "Kossuth," "The War in Circassia," "Recent Conquests in India," and "The Two Races in Canada," could not fail to engage, as they did, the attention of the audience. All the exercises displayed a vigorous intellectual character, good sense, clear thought, and as effective a delivery as could reasonably be looked for. Those who are most ready to criticize severely such performances might do well to put themselves in the situation of young men hardly passed from boyhood, standing on a stage before such an audience, and reciting, *memoriter*, a piece on some high theme, of their own composition.

President Sparks went through with the ceremony of conferring the degrees with much dignity and grace, though for the first time. The members of the graduating class having received their diplomas, the degree of Doctor of Medicine was conferred upon forty-one candidates, showing that the *regular practice* has not yet succumbed to the *aquatic* or the *atomic* theories. There were forty-five recipients of the degree of Bachelor of Laws, though only two answered to the call of the President.

The following honorary degrees were then conferred, viz: that of Doctor of Divinity, — or, according to academic usage, the title *Sacro Sanctæ Theologiæ Doctor*, — on the Rev. George Washington Burnap, of Baltimore, Md.; the Rev. Levi Washburn Leonard, of Dublin, N. H.; and the Rev. Charles Kittredge True, pastor of the Methodist Church in Charlestown.

The degree of Doctor of Laws was conferred on the Hon. George Eustis, Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Louisiana; Hon. Richard Fletcher, Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of Massachusetts; Hon. Horace Mann, late Secretary of the Board of Education, now a Representative of Massachusetts in the Congress of the United States, and the Hon. Theophilus Parsons, Dane Professor of Law in the Law School of Harvard College.

The honorary degree of Master of Arts was conferred on Francis Alger, of Boston; on Jonathan Ingersoll Bowditch, of Boston; and on Professor Arnold Guyot, late of Neufchatel, in Switzerland, now of Cambridge.

After the exercises in the church, a procession was formed at Gore Hall, of those who had received a Master's Degree, and of invited guests, and passed to Harvard Hall to dine. The Divine blessing was invoked by the Rev. Dr. Sharp, of Boston, and thanks were returned by

the Rev. Professor Stebbins, of the Theological School at Meadville, Pa. As far back as the memory of the larger number of the graduates extended, the LXXVIIIth Psalm, of the New England version, had been sung on this occasion, the tune being pitched by the now venerable Dr. Peirce of Brookline, who has been present at sixty-six Commencements, fifty-eight of them in unbroken succession. His absence and his illness were deeply felt when another voice started the tune, as they had been throughout the day. All who were present at the dinner responded, by standing in silence, to the sentiment offered by Mr. Wendell Phillips, — "The health of the Rev. John Pierce, D. D., of Brookline."

A meeting of the Graduates of the College was held in the afternoon, in University Chapel, for the purpose of reviving the Association of the Alumni. Ex-President Everett was called to the chair, and the Rev. S. K. Lothrop was chosen Secretary. The annual meeting of the Association having failed for two successive years, on account of the failure of an orator, its regular business had been suspended, and its continued existence rendered doubtful. After a most lively discussion of the question whether the Association was still alive, one worthy member affirmed that, from his own knowledge, "its estate had not been settled." This argument was satisfactory, and it was unanimously voted that the officers of the Association, last chosen, be requested to resume the exercise of their functions, and to make arrangements for literary exercises and a dinner, on next Commencement Day.

---

*Phi Beta Kappa Society, Alpha of Massachusetts.* — This Literary Society held its Anniversary at Cambridge on Thursday, July 19. After the private business had been transacted, a procession was formed at about noon, and marched to the First Parish Church. The President of the Society, Hon. Theophilus Parsons, being absent, the Hon. Robert C. Winthrop, Vice President, presided throughout the day. The Rev. Dr. Hall, of Providence, R. I., officiated as Chaplain. The Orator of the day was the Rev. George W. Bethune, D. D., of Philadelphia. His subject was "The Claims of our Country on its Literary Men." His delivery occupied two hours and five minutes. While a severe critical taste, and men of different opinions, views, and theories, might find considerable matter of discussion in the performance as a whole, and in some particular parts of it, yet the large audience agreed in pronouncing it eminently successful, full of power and thought, honest, clear-headed, sagacious, and good-tempered. There were passages of deep solemnity and of very grave appeal, separated by broad humor and a keen wit which trespassed upon satire. The vindication of the sentiment of patriotism furnished the Orator with a fit introduction. Of the Pilgrim Fathers he spoke with reverential respect, though he ventured to remind us that those who lived at the south and west sometimes heard rather too much about them, and that their descendents were sometimes inclined to act as if those Pilgrim Fathers had settled the whole country, and had left for their New England children a claim to the best part of every thing, including good bargains, and well-dowered wives from the other States. The severity of the Discourse, however, was saved to be visited on Reformers of a particular complexion, who evidently frighten themselves more than they do any one else, by threatening a destruction of the Union and its Constitution. Utilitarianism found an able defender

in Dr. Bethune. But Puseyism was unsparingly ridiculed as a matter of literary taste, of antiquarian madness, of social institutions, and and of architectural and ornamental style. It appeared that the Orator had struck his head against "a Gothic hobgoblin" carved in the canopy of a bed in which he had been seeking rest.

After the Oration, a Poem was delivered by Mr. John B. Felton. Its recondite imagery and allusions, and its rich and learned drapery, prevented that effect on the audience which so chaste and beautiful a piece of composition would be sure to have upon a reader. The Oration will lose, the Poem will gain, when the printer shall have exercised his art upon them.

The dinner of the Society was a very refined and joyous occasion. The Orator of the day poured forth more of his wit and wisdom. The strong and earnest lessons which he had spoken, and the high responsibilities which he had proved to belong to this favored nation, and to its favored class, left an impression here which he may be proud to have produced. He has raised the standard for his successor.

---

*The Boston Athenæum.* — Previous pages of our number record the interest and zeal exhibited by the late Rev. Mr. Buckminster, and the circle of his literary friends, in founding the Boston Athenæum. It is a pleasant coincidence, that, almost simultaneous with the publication of his memoirs and of his correspondence on the subject, a new and imposing structure should be opened for public use, which seems to realize his own ideas of what his cherished institution should be. At an expense of one hundred thousand dollars thus far paid, an elegant free-stone edifice, with a Palladian front of one hundred and fourteen feet, has been erected, and though not internally completed, is sufficiently finished to admit of occupancy. The basement contains rooms for packing cases, for bookbinders' work, for the residence of a janitor and watchman, and apparatus for heating and ventilating the building. The first floor, which is not yet thoroughly finished, is to contain a splendid exhibition-hall for sculpture, two reading-rooms, and a cabinet for medals, coins, and other valuable articles. The second floor is appropriated to the library, which is mostly arranged in one long hall, probably the most elegant, tasteful, and convenient for its use of any apartments in this country. Two side rooms are designed for the prospective increase of the library. The arrangements for lighting, warming, and ventilating are most perfect. The situation of the edifice, though in the very heart of the city territorially, is a quiet one, as the library rooms look out upon the Granary Cemetery, which, unlike a London churchyard, is so little used and so well adorned, as to be a sober accompaniment of good reading and wisdom rather than a nuisance. The arrangement of the books, and other important matters, prove the admirable skill and judgment of the courteous and scholarly librarian, Mr. Folsom. The third story is appropriated to a picture-gallery, the pictures being raised to it through a curiously devised passage-way, after the fashion of a dumb waiter. Many valuable paintings are owned by the institution, and are now in their places.

A further sum of twenty-five thousand dollars is requisite to complete the internal finishings and adornments of the edifice. We trust that the world-renowned liberality and literary character of our city will soon supply what is wanted. The building is an ornament to Bos-



ton. Indeed, it is the finest piece of architecture here, though we know how little is thus said. Access to the reading-room and library is very readily obtained by respectable visitors in this city, and residents who do not own shares in the institution are, very many of them, indulged with its privileges. Forty thousand volumes, of a remarkably useful character, are found in the library, and the current literature of the day is respectably represented in the reading-room. To so honorable a fulfilment have the fondly cherished hopes of Mr. Buckminster and his literary friends now attained. Let the good work be fostered still, and generously advanced.

---

*International Book-Trade.* — We have often felt a surprise, that, in the lack of an international copyright act to guard the interests of literary men, at least between England and America, English publishers did not avail themselves of a course which would at the same time secure their own interests and those of their authors. A copyright book in England is generally of very high cost, much dearer than are our books of the same character here. We observe that Lieutenant Lynch's "Expedition to the Dead Sea," which was by arrangement published simultaneously in London and Philadelphia, sells there for five dollars a copy, while the price here for a copy, in all respects equal, is one dollar. Lord Dover, in his "Review of Macaulay's History of England," in the *Edinburgh Review* for July, says, that 18,000 copies of that work were sold in England in six months. Probably treble the number were sold here. But after our markets were well supplied with various editions, neither of which was fit for a library, the London publishers sent over a large number of copies, to be sold here at half the retail price in England. If they had done this when the work was first issued, they might doubtless have disposed of twenty-five thousand copies; and when the types are set, copies may be multiplied at little more than the cost of paper and binding. Why do not London publishers generally avail themselves of this resource, and forestall our market with numerous copies of their best books, of the same mechanical character, and at one half or one third of the London price? They certainly stand in their own light if they refuse to do this. Messrs. Little & Brown of Boston have made an arrangement with the Edinburgh publishers, by which they can furnish the *Edinburgh Review* within a fortnight of its appearance in Great Britain, at four dollars a year. The American reprint of that *Review* costs three dollars a year, or two dollars when taken with three others. But the value of the English edition is greatly increased by the advertisements, fly-leaves, and literary information which are to be found in numerous pages sewed up with each number.

---

#### OBITUARY.

In the Sermon preached by the Rev. Dr. Dewey, at the ordination of Mr. C. M. Taggart, at Albany, appropriate mention was made of the late Hon. HARMANUS BLEECKER, one of the most honored and devoted members of the Unitarian Society in that city. Mr. Bleecker was a distinguished man, universally respected for his talents and virtues, and held in high esteem by his fellow-citizens, of all sects and

parties, for his affability, his friendliness, and his integrity. He was born of a distinguished family, in 1779, and was, for many years, a partner, in the practice of the law, with the late Hon. Theodore Sedgwick. He was a member of Congress during the exciting times of the last war with England, of which he was an earnest opponent, preferring peace, and believing that it might have been maintained. Mr. Bleecker was appointed United States Minister to the Hague, by his friend, President Van Buren. In this official capacity, which he sustained for many years, he won the highest respect and confidence of the Dutch people and of the court, whose language was perfectly familiar to him, and received the unusual tribute of a public address on resigning his mission. Before his return to this country, he married the accomplished lady whom he has left as his widow, and found much happiness in a connection which brightened the hospitalities of his home, and increased the natural cheerfulness and graces of his character. He was a most zealous, well-informed, and hearty disciple of Liberal Christianity.

---

#### DEATH OF THE REV. DR. PIERCE.

WHILE the press waits for our last sheet, we have opportunity and space only to record the death of the venerable and honored Senior Pastor of the First Church in Brookline. He expired peacefully at the parsonage just before noon on Friday, August 24th. We of course defer to another time such a commemoration of the life and character, of the virtues and services, of our deceased father in the ministry, as will be expected from this journal. His gradual decline from a state of apparently remarkable vigor to a condition of feebleness, without severe pain, has enabled his friends to resort to his study, and there to hold most delightful communion with him. The serenity of spirit which was so strikingly exhibited at the commencement of his illness, when he was compelled to forego his activity and be ministered to, continued with him to the last conscious hour. We have observed in his later years almost a pride and boast of health, and the power of enduring fatigue. His very early rising, his physical exertions, and his long walks, with his scrupulous temperance in diet, may perhaps be charged by some as the causes of his last illness, which was almost his only illness. But, at any rate, if it could be proved that they shortened his days, it may well be added that his years were of good measure, while his habits of life made them healthful and happy, and gave peace to their close.

Dr. Pierce entered upon his seventy-seventh year on the fourteenth day of July last. All who saw him a year or two ago would have said that he stood the fairest of all the sons of Harvard as a candidate for the place of honor on the catalogue, as the oldest graduate whose name should bear no star. The *post mortem* examination of his body, which he himself desired, and which has just taken place as we write, exhibits an internal cancerous affection, diffused through the system. The knowledge of this fact will surprise those who, on their visits to Dr. Pierce, were relieved at hearing from his own lips that he suffered no pain.

He has gone from us, without ever having had an enemy on the earth, and his last utterance was in the words, "entire submission to God."